The Catholic University of America
Studies in Sacred Theology
(Second Series)
No. 79

Catholic Moral Teaching on the Nature and Object of Conjugal Love

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF SACRED THEOLOGY OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF, THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF SACRED THEOLOGY

BY THE

REVEREND MICHAEL FRANCIS McAULIFFE, S.T.L.

This dissertation was directed by The Very Rev. Dr. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., as Major Professor, and was approved by Rev. Dr. Alfred C. Rush, C.SS.R., and Rev. Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P.. as readers.

The Catholic University of America
Studies in Sacred Theology
(Second Series)
No. 79

Catholic Moral Teaching on the Nature and Object of Conjugal Love

A DISSERTATION

submitted to the faculty of the school of sacred theology of
the CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF SACRED THEOLOGY

BY THE

REVEREND MICHAEL FRANCIS McAULIFFE, S.T.L.

The Catholic University of America Press
Washington, D. C.
1954

NIHIL OBSTAT:

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., S.T.D.

Censor Deputatus

Washington, D. C., April 27, 1953.

IMPRIMATUR:

Edwin V. O'Hara, D.D.

Bishop of Kansas City

Kansas City, Mo., May 11, 1953.

Copyright 1954
by
The Catholic University of America Press, Inc.

Murray and Heister
Washington, D. C.

Printed by
Times and News Publishing Co.
Gettysburg, pa., U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

This is a dissertation which was submitted to the Faculty of the School of Sacred Theology of the Catholic University of America. The writer wishes to express his thanks to His Excellency, the Most Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, Bishop of Kansas City, who gave him the opportunity of pursuing graduate studies at the Catholic University. He owes a debt of gratitude to the Faculty of the School of Sacred Theology whose classes he attended. In particular he wishes to thank the Very Reverend Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., S.T.D., under whose direction the thesis was written, and to the Rev. Alfred C. Rush, C.SS.R.» S.T.D., and the Rev. Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P., S.T.D., for their reading of the dissertation and many helpful suggestions.

INTRODUCTION

In this age when the attention of men has been focused principally on the material things of the universe, we notice an ever-increasing apathy in regard to the supernatural objectives which Almighty God intended us to pursue as the chief object of our existence. This state inevitably results when men set aside the things of God and disregard and ignore the purpose for which they were created and to which they have been supernaturally elevated. It is to this state of man's conscience that we can attribute the present lack of esteem and regard for the vocation of Christian marriage. It has progressed to such an extent that men such as these no longer consider marriage as something instituted by God. They set aside its God-given purposes, and give to it a purpose which is in accord only with their human desires, and which can be adapted to fit their likes and dislikes. Thus when their caprice dictates and they have tired of *one* relationship, they have no difficulty in shifting their affections to another, hoping that in this new partner they will find the satisfaction their selfishness demands. God's will means nothing *to them;* their own everything. As our late Holy Father, Pope Pîus XI, has so well stated:

> To begin at the very source of these evils, their basic principle lies in this, that matrimony is repeatedly declared to be not instituted by the Author of nature nor raised by Christ the Lord to the dignity of a true sacrament, but invented by man. . . . The evil of this teaching is plainly seen from the consequences which its advocates deduce from it, namely, that the laws, institutions and customs by which wedlock is governed, since they take their origin solely from the will of man, are subject entirely to him, hence can and must be founded, changed and abrogated according to human caprice and the shifting circumstances of human affairs; that the generative power which is grounded in nature itself is more sacred and has wider range than matrimony—-hence it may be exercised both outside as well as within the confines of wedlock, with the ends of matrimony being set aside,

> as though to suggest that the license of a base fornicating woman should enjoy the same rights as the chaste motherhood of a lawfully wedded wife.[1]

As a direct result of this state of man's conscience marriage has been brought to the position wherein every year sees a new record established for those marriages that end in divorce courts. Statistics show that the divorce rate, which had maintained an average of 1.7 per 1,000 population during the years 1920-40, has gradually risen to the point where it now averages 2.0 per 1,000 population, reached in 1950, the last year for which statistics are available.[2] This means that approximately one marriage out of every four or five in the United States ends in divorce. If the trend continues, and circumstances indicate that it will, this condition will become even worse. The tragedy of this situation is that so many religious bodies fail to consider the condition as an evil, and even go so far as to allow divorced members to be "remarried" in their churches as a matter of course. Marriage accepted in this sense is really not marriage, but a cloak, a screen, behind which such a class of people pretend to hide decently and legitimately what is nothing but plain adultery. Our Blessed Saviour clearly taught that remarriage after divorce was adultery when He said: "Everyone who puts away his wife and marries another commits adul-

[1] Pope Pius XI, *"Casti Connubii,"* AAS, 22 (1930), 557 f.: "Ut igitur ab horum malorum fontibus incipiamus, praecipua eorum radix in eo est quod matrimonium non ab auctore naturae institutum neque a Christo Domino in veri Sacramenti dignitatem evectum, sed ab hominibus inventum *vocitent*. . . . Perniciosissima vero haec commenta esse, ex consectariis etiam elucet, quae ipsi illorum defensores inde deducunt: leges, instituta ac mores quibus connubium regatur, cum sola hominum voluntate sint parta, ei soli subesse, ideoque pro humano lubitu et humanarum rerum vicissitudinibus condi, immutari, abrogari et posse et debere; generativam autem vim, quippe quae in ipsa natura nitatur, et sacratiorem esse et latius patere quam matrimonium; exercere igitur posse tam extra quam intra connubii claustra, etiam neglectis matrimonii finibus, quasi scilicet impudicae mulieris licentia eisdem fere gaudeat iuribus, quibus legitimae uxoris casta maternitas." (PPt, pp. 15-16.)

[2] *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1952* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952), p. 59.

tery ; and he who marries a woman who has been put away from her husband commits adultery."[3]*

The divorce problem is only one of the problems that this modern attitude toward marriage has intensified in the lives of married people today. There are several that deserve intense consideration. These are: infidelity, contraception, and not least of all, abortion. These problems in some degree have been the scourge of mankind all throughout its history. As a direct answer to these problems we wish to point to the use of a virtue which occupies a position of great prominence in the lives of all men. That virtue is the virtue of love, and, in this instance, it is specifically conjugal love. It is this virtue that we will discuss in this thesis. By it we mean that natural love of husband and wife which is perfected by the grace of the Sacrament of Matrimony. This grace strengthens the indissoluble unity of the marriage state and sanctifies the spouses? This is the love of which St. Paul spoke when he wrote to the Ephesians: "Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for her, that he might sanctify her, cleansing her in the bath of water by means of the word."[5]

It is our thesis that the primary object of conjugal love is the mutual sanctification of the spouses. We know that: "Saint Paul, writing to the Christian converts, addresses them as persons called to be Saints. It is clear from this mode of address that, in the eyes of the Apostle, the vocation of every Christian, as such, is that he be a Saint."[6] Besides what we may speak of as this general call to sanctification for all Christians, we may also speak of a special vocation to sanctity. One may be called to a particular state of life, a particular vocation, where, in a specific way, he will seek out his

[3] Luke 16:18.

* *Canones et Decreta Sacrosancti Oecuntenici Concilii Tridenlini* (Ratisbonne: G. J. Manz, 1903), pp. 135-136: "Gratiam vero, quae naturalem illum amorem perficeret, et indissolubilem unitatem confirmaret, coniugesque sanctificaret, ispe Christus, venerabilium sacramentorum institutor atque perfector, sua nobis passione promeruit. . ."

[5] Ephesians 5 :25.

[6] Leen, Edward, C.S.SP., *Progress Through Mental Prayer* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1940), p. 3.

sanctification. It is in this manner that we speak of the priesthood, wherein one seeks sanctity by being a mediator between God and men. So also we may speak of marriage as a state in which sanctity can be sought. But we must distinguish this type of sanctity, because here not one but two lives are concerned. Because of the closeness of their lives, the intimacy in which husband and wife must live, we describe their search for sanctity as a seeking after mutual sanctification. Pope Pius XI, speaking of this, says:

> This outward expression of love in the home demands not only mutual help but must go further; must have as its primary purpose *(immo hoc in primis intendat)* that man and wife help each other day by day in forming and perfecting themselves in the interior life, so that through their partnership in life they may advance ever more and more in virtue, and above all that they may grow in true love towards God and their neighbor, on which indeed "dependeth the whole Law and the Prophets. . . ." This mutual inward moulding of husband and wife, this determined effort to perfect each other, can in a very real real sense, as the Roman Catechism teaches, be said to be the chief reason and purpose of matrimony. . .[7]

Through their mutual love the spouses not only try to free their paths from the inroads of sin, but also in a very positive manner attempt to progress together on the paths of virtue.

We also wish to show in this thesis the proper position of conjugal love as one of the ends of marriage. Our reason for doing this was the inauguration of a new school of thought among a number of Catholic writers under the leadership of Dr. Dorns.

[7] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* p. 548. "Hoc autem opus in domestica societate non modo mutuum auxilium complectitur, verum etiam ad hoc extendatur oportet, immo hoc in primis intendat, ut coniuges inter se iuventur ad interiorem hominem plenius in dies conformandum perficiendumque; ita ut per mutuam vitae consortionem in virtutibus magis magisque in dies proficiant, et praecipue in vera erga Deum proximasque charitate crescant, in qua denique 'universa Lex pendet et Prophetae. . . Haec mutua coniugum interior conformatio, hoc assiduum sese invicem perficiendi studium, verissima quadam ratione, ut docet Catechismus Romanus, etiam primaria matrimonii causa et ratio dici potest. . (PPt, p. 8 (italics mine).)

It may be noted that their tenets run counter to the traditional teaching of the Church on the ends of marriage, as may be evidenced in a statement made'by their leader.

> The constitution of marriage, the union of two persons, does not then consist in their subservience to a purpose outside themselves, for which they marry. It consists in the constant vital ordination of husband and wife to each other until they become one. If this is so, there can no longer be sufficient reason, from this standpoint, for speaking of procreation as the primary purpose (in the sense in which St. Thomas used the phrase) and for dividing off the other purposes as secondary.§

These men despite their failings can be said to have rendered an important service to theology. Though they did overemphasize the position of conjugal love in marriage, yet, that very overemphasis served to prod theologians generally into the admission of conjugal love to its rightful place in marriage. And, moreover, as Father Francis Connell has observed especially in regard to Dr. Doms :

> it would be unjust to deny that certain features of his teaching deserve to be given greater emphasis in our exposition of the Catholic doctrine of matrimony, particularly the spirit of generosity that should be fostered by matrimony, the exalted and unselfish love it should inspire, the spiritual significance of sexual intercourse which renders it far more sublime than a biological process or a source of sensual gratification.®

It will be the work of this thesis to show that a correct understanding of conjugal love, together with a proper application of its principles to the problems at hand, will go far to remedy the ailments that afflict marriage. We will consider first the nature of

§ Doms, Dr. Herbert, *The Meaning of Marriage.* Translated by George Sayer. (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1939), p. 87.

"Connell, Francis J., C.SS.R., "The Catholic Doctrine on the Ends of Marriage," *Proceedings of the Foundation Meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America* (New York City, June 25, 26, 1946), pp. 40-41.

the love that precedes marriage. We do this in order to avoid confusing it with that romantic notion of love which is so prevalent today, and also to set forth the foundation upon which we will base the distinction of conjugal love itself. We will point out that, though one may be, what we describe as, "technically in love," still this love must conform to the ideals of the Christian dispensation, or run the risk of failure. In treating the nature of conjugal love, we will discuss principally its specific difference from other types of love, especially pre-marital love. Thence we proceed with a description of the qualities that go to complete its development. We will propose as the primary object of conjugal love the "mutual sanctification" of the spouses, and consider it in relation to the general and primary purpose of marriage. Finally, in developing our arguments for the malice of the various evils that afflict marriage, we will give our attention first to the primary reasons for their gravity, and then apply secondary reasons deduced from the nature of conjugal love. It is our belief that the utilization of this emotion of love, with the prominence, it holds in human affairs, will prove singularly effective in helping to restore marriage to its true Christian signification.

CHAPTER I

The Nature of Pre-Marital Love

Although it is in the nature of things that marriage should be the normal vocation of human beings, marriage is not of such a spontaneous nature in man that it will come to him without his exercising any efforts to bring it about. Man must act upon the tendencies that have been placed within him by nature, and which draw him into association with members of the opposite sex. His voluntary reactions to these tendencies and to the attractions of the opposite sex, and of course their consequent effect on him, will then lead him into marriage.[1] Of all the charms and attractions which nature has implanted in man to lead him thus, the most prominent, the one impelling most people to the married state, is that of love. It is of the nature of this love that we shall speak in this chapter. Before doing this, however, we shall take a brief glance at God's plan for marriage.

God, the Supreme End of all mankind, was completely happy in Himself. He contained all perfections; but it was his wish that his goodness be extended and manifested to others. To accomplish this he willed that others should share in his glory. Consequently, he created the human race and installed Adam as its primogenitor.

> And the Lord God said: It is not good for man to be alone; let us make him a help like unto himself. . . . And the Lord God built the rib which he took from Adam into a woman: and brought her to Adam. . . . Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they shall be two in one flesh. . . .[2]

Those who were to be partakers of God's glory were not only

[1] For a discussion of the attractions of one sex to the other, cf. *infra,* p. 8 f.

[2] Gen. 2:18, 22, 24.

going to be created by God, but they themselves were going to have a participation in that creative work, God was granting to them a "contributory" partnership; they were to cooperate with him in bringing into existence human life like their own.[3] "For He had said to them: Increase and multiply and fill the earth. . . ."[4] This, then, was the manner in which God instituted marriage. Moreover, that the purpose for which it was instituted might be faithfully accomplished, He further endowed it with two most important properties, unity and indissolubility. When Christ went forth to preach his Gospel, he confirmed the Creator's teaching: "Have you not read that the Creator, from the beginning, made them male and female, and said, 'For this cause a man shall leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh'? What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder."[5] Finally, He gave to it its ultimate completeness and perfection; He elevated Christian Marriage to the dignity of a Sacrament.[6]

The necessity for discussing the nature of pre-marital love is readily seen from the importance it holds in the preparation for marriage. The question is frequently asked, "What do people seek in married life?" To which we would reply, they are seeking chiefly the unique joy and happiness that can only come from such an intimately close common-life. But if asked how they are to attain such, we would reply they are to attain it by following the attraction of love. Love is the motive impelling and inspiring them to contract marriage. It is true they may have other reasons for entering the married state, e.g., their primary desire may be the desire of children. But ultimately it is love which inspires them to carry out these ends. "It is love that attracts a young man and young woman towards each other and that later leads them

[3] Mersch, Emile, S.J., *Morality and the Mystical Body.* Trans, by Daniel Ryan, SJ. (New York: P. J. Kennedy, 1939), p. 209.

[4] Gen. 1:28.

[5] Mt. 19:4-6.

[6] "Cappello, Felix M., S.J., *Tractatus Canonico-Moralis De Sacramentis* (5th ed., Rome: Marietti, 1947), V, p. 23.

to-blend their lives in marriage."[7] Vermeersch also indicates this when he says:

> That amorous union of two persons, to which love aspires, indicates another natural cause, not secondary, for the contracting of marriage. The definition of Roman Law by which matrimony is described as: "the joining of man and woman, retaining an undivided mode of life," contains the cause.[8]

And even more clearly has he stated this in his catechism based on the Encyclical of Pope Pius XI: "The marriage bond sets up between the spouses an intimacy which no other surpasses or even equals; the marriage would never have been entered upon without the mutual affection which was necessary for the parties to give themselves to each other."[9] Finally we have the opinion of Father Thomas Hanley, who writes: "this happiness (arising from a common life) is the immediate object which a man and woman seek for in their union. But though love gives them the desire for such union, this love is not at all something merely physical."[10] Love is thus seen as the impulse which draws a man and woman together to seek happiness. Through love the sexes are enabled in large measure to discover the hazardous but none the less joyous trials that accompany the state of marriage. Then again it is upon this love that specifically conjugal love is based. One is largely dependent upon the other. Pre-marital love precedes and lays the foundation; conjugal love then builds on that foundation. If the one is strong, then it is a good indication that

[7] Marriage-Preparation Course, The Catholic Centre (Ottawa: University of Ottawa, 1946), p. 47.

[8] Vermeersch, A., S.J., *Theologia Moralis* (3rd. ed., Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1944), IV, p. 32. "Simul tamen amorosa ista duarum personarum confusio, ad quam amor aspirat, indicat aliam causam naturalem, non secundariam, contrahendi, quam continet definitio îuris romani qua matrimonium describitur 'viri et mulieris coniunctio, individuam consuetudinem vitae continens' . . ."

[9] Vermeersch, A. S.J., *What Is Marriage?* Trans, by T. L. Bouscaren, SJ. (New York: The America Press, 1932), q. 51, p. 22.

[10] "Thomas R. Hanley, "Natural Law on Marriage," TER, 108 (1943), P- 300.

the other will be strong too. Love, viewed in this manner, cannot fail to have an importance and value for marriage.

A true conception of the nature of this love will also provide those intent on marriage with their best protection against the dangers of that false "romantic" love so prevalent today. This notion of love has been broadcast widely through the media of the screen, the radio and the press. Pope Pius XI in warning of the evils of the movies also warned us of the evils of this false "romantic" love. He states:

> Everyone knows what damage is done to the soul by bad motion pictures. They are occasions of sin; they seduce young people along the ways of sin by glorifying the passions; they show life under a false light; they cloud ideals; they destroy pure love, respect for marriage and affection for the family.[11]

This warning applies equally to the press and radio. In glorifying this love they make it something that it is not. For they substitute a purely physical attraction in place of a love which should embrace both mind and heart. This attraction is but for the moment; its perdurance is brief; and in marriage is soon discovered for its true worth. It thus becomes one of the greatest causes for unhappiness, forcing those who have been ensnared by it to seek refuge in separation and even divorce. If people would only realize the risk entailed in entering a marriage founded upon it, the institution of marriage would not now be undergoing the travail to which it is subjected.

Before we enter our discussion on the precise nature of this love, let us first obtain some clear ideas on the notion of love in general. To these we will add some few definitions around which our thesis

[11] Pope Pius XI, *"Vigilanti Cura,"* AAS, 28 (1936), 255 f.: "In comperto cuique est quantopere improbae id genus scaenae in spectatorum animos influant; ut cupidinum enim libidinumque laudes efferunt, ita vitiorum occasionem praebent; iuvenes a recto itinere transversos agunt; ducendae vitae rationem fucata lucis specie proponunt; capessandae perfectionis consilia infuscant atque debilitant; castum denique amorem, matrimonii sanctitatem atque intimas domestici convictus necessitudines restinguunt." (N.C.W.C. translation, 9 f.)

revolves. First—the notion of "end" or *"finis."* An en3 is a good to be attained or produced.[12] In its technical sense it signifies a good toward whose attainment an agent or action tends either by inclination of nature *(finis operis)* or by his own deliberate will *(finis operantis)*,[13] The *"finis operis"* is divided into primary and secondary. By primary we mean the end or purpose to which a person or an object or an institution is primarily inclined in accordance with the law of nature and the intention of God, If many ends are assigned to an object by nature, there should be one "primary" and principal with the *ratio* of a formal cause, in which the other ends are contained. Upon this primary end the other ends have a certain dependence and direction.[14][15] On the other hand, the "secondary" end (or ends) is that end to which an object is secondarily directed by nature and through the attainment of which is accomplished the better, easier, more secure and fuller attainment of the "primary" end. Without this end the "primary" end cannot be perfectly realized; in fact it is almost morally impossible of attainment. The "secondary" end also bespeaks a fundamental subordination; but it may be thought to have a certain independence if considered in its actual realization, e.g., *per accidens,* circumstances may be such as to preclude the attainment of the primary end. In this case, since the secondary end is the effect achieved, it can be said to have a certain independence. Finally, the *finis operantis* is that end which the agent himself assigns to his action. This may or may not correspond with the end which nature herself assigns to that action.[18]

Love in general can be defined as "an affective union of the will

[12] John C. Ford, S.J., "Marriage: Its Meaning and Purposes," ThS, *3* (1942), p. 349.

[13] The Sacred Roman Rota, AAS, 36 (1944), 184 f.: "Verbum 'finis' in fontibus allegatis sumitur in sensu technico et significat bonum in quod obtinendum tenditur, sive ex indole naturae sive ex intentione deliberate agentis."

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 185. "Unde provenit, quod ubi *plures* unius eiusdemque societatis assignantur 'fines operis,' ex iis *unus* debeat esse *primus* et principalis, rationem causae formalis habens, in quo alii fines contineantur . . ."

[15] Cf. also: Ford, *op. cii.,* 368 f.; and Merkelbach, B., O.P., *Summa Theologiae Moralis* (3rd. ed., Paris: Desclee, 1939), III, p. 755 f.

with a known good. It is a union because true love cannot exist without some manner of union with its object—affective, because all love carries with it a certain complacency and delectation of the soul . . . This love can be divided by reason of its subject into sensual and spiritual; by reason of the end to which it is directed into natural and supernatural; and by reason of its formal object into love of concupiscence, love of benevolence, and love of friendship.[16] The union of the sensible appetite with some sensible good and the complacency of the sensitive appetite in the good sensibly apprehended is called a sensible or sensitive love; it is concerned with qualities which are pleasing to the senses, and which are changeable and of slight importance—r whence the love thus arising is vain and inconstant.[17] In this thesis this love has a special meaning, so, as Leclercq suggests: "Let us here restrict physical love to the meaning that it usually has: the movement of the sex instinct which tends toward self-gratification?'[18] Rational (spiritual) love consists in the union of the will with some intelligible good, and the complacency of the will in the good apprehended by the intellect. It is based on moral and intellectual qualities, such as . , . wisdom, knowledge, prudence, etc., . . . This love is worthy of man since it is founded on qualities truly human, and is more constant since it is dependent

[16] P. Brin, A. Farges, and D. Barbedette, *Philosophia Scholastica* (68th cd. Paris: Berche and Pagis, 1937), I, p. 418. "Amor in universum est . . . *unio voluntatis affectiva cum bono cognito.*—Dicitur *unio,* quia verus amor existere nequit sine quadam unione cum objecto: *affectiva* vero, quia omnis amor quamdam animae complacentiam et delectationem importat. . . . Amor autem in genere dividi potest, ratione *subjecti,* in sensualem et spiritualem; ratione *finis,* in naturalem et supernaturalem; ratione tandem *objecti* formalis, in amorem concupiscentiae, benevolentiae et amicitiae."

[17] Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* I, p. 649. "Similiter coaptatio appetitus sensitivi ad aliquod bonum sensibile et complacentia appetitus sensitivi in bono sensibiliter apprehenso dicitur *amor sensibilis seu sensitivus,* qui versatur circa qualitates quae sensibus placent quaeque frivolae sunt et mutabiles, unde amor qui exinde nascitur est vanus et inconstans."

[18] Leclercq, Jacques, *Marriage and the Family.* Trans, by Thomas R. Hanley, O.S.B. (New York: Pustet, 1942), p. 120.

upon properties that are less changeable and more stable.[10] We say love is the principle of the motion by which one tends toward the thing loved. In a natural appetite the principle of ^Jiis motion is the connaturality of the one seeking to that towards which he tends. This is natural love.[30] In the supernatural love of charity a difficulty arises since the object of this love is God Himself, who is loved for his own goodness.[21] It would be impossible for a creature by his own unaided powers to achieve this type of love because of the disproportion between himself and God. To remove that disproportion which naturally exists, the creature's power to love must be elevated, and is so by a divine influx whereby the natural potency becomes capable of a supernatural act.[22] Before we proceed further we will divide the objects of this supernatural love, as the secondary object will have particular importance in this thesis. The primary material object, of course, is God and God alone.[23] The secondary material object is that which is loved not for its own sake but because of its relation to the primary object. But to God, supernaturally lovable, are ordainable all rational creatures. Thus humans may be loved with a supernatural love as long as this love retains its ordination to

10 Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* I, p, 649. "Coaptatio voluntatis ad aliquod bonum intelligibile et complacentia voluntatis in bono intellectu apprehenso dicitur *amor rationalis,* qui oritur ex dotibus intellectualibus et moralibus uti . . . sapientia, scientia, prudentia. . . . Amor iste dignus est hominis utpote qualitatibus vere humanis fundatus ; estque magis constans utpote dotibus innixus quae minus mutabiles sunt et magis stabiles."

20 *Ibid.,* pp. 648-49. "amor dicitur illud quod est *principium* motus tendentis in finem amatum: a) In appetitu autem naturali principium huiusmodi motus est connaturalitas appetentis ad id in quod tendit, quae dici potest amor naturalis . .

a Ibid., p. 677. "Obiectum materiale principale charitatis est ipse Deus finis supernaturalis qui *per se propter bonitatem propriam amatur* , .

22Hervé, J. M., *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae* (Paris: Berche et Pagis, 1929), III, p. 120. "Juxta omnes supernaturalitas actuum provenit ex *principio* eorum *elicitivo,* nempe ex *divino influxu* quo elevatur et completur potentia naturalis in ratione *principii activi* actus supernaturalis."

23 *Ibid.,* p. 349. 'Objectum materiale *primarium* . . . est Deus et Deus tantum."

God.[34] Finally, to sum up the differences between natural and supernatural love, we refer back to St. Thomas, who says: "God, in so far as he is the general good from whom all natural good depends, is loved with a natural love by everyone; in so far, however, as He is the good who makes all happy in supernatural bliss, he is loved with the love of charity."[25] Viewing the formal object of love, we find that the love of concupiscence is a love whereby we love something because of the good, the advantages, and the usefulness it brings to us. In the love of benevolence we love someone or something because of the good in him or it. Lastly, through the love of friendship we love a friend not only for the good in him, but also because He returns the love we have given him.[28]

God has placed in the two sexes a mutual attraction whereby they will be drawn to each other, and ultimately prompt them to assume the duties and the responsibilities imposed upon those united in the bond of marriage. Sacred Scripture tells us: "The sons of God seeing the daughters of men, that they were fair, took to themselves, wives of all which they chose."[21] And again it recounts: "And Jacob being in love with her said: I will serve thee seven years for Rachel thy younger daughter."[28] Treating of

[M] *Ibid.,* 'Objectum materiale *secundarium* charitatis, illud est quod non ratione sui sed ratione objecti primarii et per ordinem ad illud diligitur. Atqui ad Deum, supernaturaliter amabilem et amandum, ordinabiles sunt omnes creaturae rationales, quae vel *actu* vel *potentia* participant divinam beatitudinem. Ergo omnes creaturae rationales (praeter damnatos) diligendae sunt amore caritatis."

[®] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae,* I, q. 60, a. 5, ad 4. "Ad *quartum* dicendum, quod Deus, secundum quod est universale bonum, a quo dependet omne bonum naturale, diligitur naturali dilectione ab unoquoque. Inquantum vero est bonum beatificans universaliter omnes supernatural! beatitudine, sic diligitur dilectione charitatis."

[“] Brin, Farges and Barbedette, *op. cit.,* p. 418. "Amor *concupiscentiae* dicitur ille quo appetitus bonum, quatenus est bonum nostrum. . . Per amorem *benevolentiae,* bonum amamus quatenus in se bonum et amabile. . . In amore tandem *amicitiae,* diligimus amicum, non solum ut bonum in se, verum etiam quia nos amantes redamat."

[27] Gen. 6:2.

[“]Gen. 29:18.

this Father Gerald Kelly, S.J., remarks; "As a member of a definite sex, each has a natural God-given attraction towards the other sex which is quite different from the attraction that we normally experience towards the members of our own sex."[20] Father Kelly classifies this attraction inherent in the members of each sex as *general sex attraction:* "(it) may he defined negatively by stating that it is not directed towards any purely physical satisfaction and is not centered exclusively on an individual. It consists mainly in a somewhat intriguing interest in the members of the other sex and a peculiar responsiveness to their distinctive qualities."[30] The reason for this attraction lies in the differences that exist between the sexes. Each has something that he can give the other; each lacks something that he will find in the other. As Father Kelly points out: "Men for instance are especially attracted by the grace, the emotional susceptibility, the beauty, the tenderness of women. Women are attracted by the strength, the courage, the energy, the calm deliberation of men."[31] Father Bakcwell Morrison, S.J., in treating of these distinguishing characteristics attributes them to a difference in their physical constitution as given them by nature herself:

> There is a physiological foundation for the differences in feeling between boy and girl. Nature has given them a different make-up and with it a different degree of susceptibility. It is commonly said that the woman is more soul than the man, that in woman love will begin in the soul and will descend by its own steps to the body while in man it begins rather in the body and makes its way to the soul,[82]

Because of these qualities and distinguishing features we say that/the sexes are mutually complementary. It is in this "mutual complementariness" that one feels the need of the other; and[28]

[28] Kelly, Gerald, S.J., *Modern Youth and Chastity* (St. Louis: The Queen's Work, 1943), p. 13.

[80] *Ibid.*

[81] *Ibid.*

[88] Morrison, Bakewell, S.J., *Character Formation in College* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1938), p. 128.

from this general need will arise a particular attachment. From such an attraction, small though it may be in the beginning, but fostered and nourished, come the associations that culminate in love and marriage. Thus we can see a picture of the general means that God has provided for attracting men and women to each other. They are a universal endowment to the human race, even to the celibate who will never use them for the purpose for which they were primarily intended.

From this general attraction of the sexes, which as it were sets the stage, is begun the attraction of a particular person of one sex for an individual of the other. We speak here of the immediate and specific qualities leading to marriage. When this takes place, we can recognize the beginning of the emotional state of love, which is the predecessor of marriage. It serves a very particular purpose in ascertaining the suitability of the parties to each other. Upon its strength will depend to a great extent the possibility of reconciling those differences, however small, which are found in the character of every man and woman. For if true love is to exist, it must be strong enough to compensate for the faults they will find in each other. In treating the nature of this love, it must be noted that we are speaking of it as it happens to two ordinary people. We are not, as yet, concerned as to whether they are proper and fit subjects of love, or whether their love has received its proper direction in accordance with the decrees of God. But we are concerned about its nature and characteristics. One of the simplest, yet one of the best treatments we have seen of this subject, is the one by Father Kelly, from which we have previously quoted. He describes it thus:

> *Personal sex attraction* has this in common with all friendship that it is an attraction to a *person,* a definite person, and not a mere general interest or a physical attraction to the body. . . Perhaps the most distinctive characteristic of *personal sex attraction* is its *exclusiveness.* A person thus attracted wants complete possession of the beloved. The mere presence of a third party is resented. . . . Definitely, it is an emotional fascination .... it is generally found that the attachment is based on one or more of the characteristics that attract one sex

> to the other, only now these attractions have suddenly acquired a sort of personification in this one *wonderful* boy or' girl, as the case may be. Absence, e\Vn for a short period, is hard on this exclusive love. It creates an absorbing feeling of dissatisfaction, a yearning for the other's presence. ... If *personal sex attraction* is mutual, then the natural result of its absorbing exclusiveness and intensity is a complete mutual assimilation of interests in the two parties . . . this type of mutual attraction locks the hearts together . . . each craves a complete oneness with the other ; they want to blend and share their entire lives. What a perfect psychological inducement to marriage [38]

This, then, is the nature of this love. A notable distinguishing mark is its exclusiveness. It is directed toward a certain definite person. Nothing too much nor too good can be done for the other. Each strives with heart and mind to please. They are united heart and soul, in much the same manner as two endowed with conjugal love. Although this love partakes somewhat of the spiritual character of conjugal love, in no way does it give the right to partake of the physical qualities of this love. And for this very good reason as evidenced by Father A. Vermeersch, S.J,,: "There is no surrender of bodily rights made in betrothals ; these prepare for marriage solely through a union of souls. Although they may permit a certain venereal pleasure, the engaged couple cannot deliberately seek it or consent to it."[84] This does not mean that things of a sensible nature, such as kisses moderately performed, may not be a part of this love. They are, even as Vermeersch again tells us:

> Honorable manifestations of love in accordance with custom are lawful between the engaged, e.g., kisses moderately performed. And too the sensible but not physical pleasure which normally accompanies this manifestation

" Kelly, *op. cit.,* pp. 18-20.

""Vermeersch, A., S.J., *Theologia Moralis,* IV, p. 16. "Sed' quia nulla corporum traditio sponsalibus facta est, et sponsalia per solam animarum unionem praeparant matrimonium, delectationem veneream permittere quidem possunt, non autem deliberate quaerere vel admittere."

> of love is permitted. For it is an altogether praiseworthy end to nourish and foster that love which leads to marriage.[35]

However, remembering the distinction that Vermeersch makes between sensible and carnal delectation, and also the restriction made by Leclercq,[36] we wish to point out that we do not consider these manifestations as strictly physical love, at least in the sense in which that type of love is used in this thesis. Again, we don't wish to exclude in this love a certain physical attraction that usually accompanies it, i.e., the quality of physical beauty which exerts a certain attraction serving to draw the sexes together. In conclusion, we may say that this love is essentially a union of mind and heart which tends toward exclusiveness. It is physical only in the sense that it may be said to cause a slight sensible delectation in those who partake of it.

In view of what we have already stated concerning the nature of this love, we may now say that this love has no other purpose but to lead people to marriage. Pursuant to this, Father Kelly declares:

> No two people can cultivate a companionship like this and assure themselves that they will not want to get married. Countless others have tried that and failed. As a matter of fact, if this attraction is not intended to lead to marriage, why should it have the effect of so completely locking the heart of one person to the exclusion of others? *Marriage is the only state of life that requires such a love*[37]

This love then serves the purpose of immediately attracting two people to the state of marriage. It is the special plan that God has provided for marriage. It is for this reason that this man will choose this woman; this individual will select that individual and

Ibid., "Omnino licitae sunt inter sponsos honestae amoris significationes secundum morem patriae, puta oscula, moderate adhibitae. Nec repudianda est delectatio sensibilis, non carnalis, quae huiusmodi demonstrationem comitatur. Honestus enim est finis conciliandi et fovendi mutuum amorem in ordine ad matrimonium. . ."

[36] Leclercq, *op. cit.,* p. 120.

[37] Kelly, *op. cit.,* p. 20. (Italics mine.)

so on. However, we do not mean to infer that/this will happen always and inevitably. Frequently the expected marriage will not take place. But, in the ordinary course of events, love will take its natural course by resulting in marriage.

In continuing our treatment of this subject, it will be necessary to change our manner of approach somewhat. This stems from the fact that we must not only know what love is but also what safeguards should surround it. These will center their attention chiefly on the direction this love should take, because certain persons are rendered ineligible as objects of love, while others, through their inability to meet the required standards, are deemed unworthy associates in the task of love. Our late Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, as he approached the end of his celebrated Encyclical on Christian Marriage, *"Casti Connubii,"* paused to state that the success of his teaching on marriage, "depend(s) in large measure on the due preparation, remote and proximate, of the parties for marriage."[38] He, therefore, admonished those selfsame parties :

> Let then, those who are about to enter on married life, approach that state well disposed and well prepared, so that they will be able, as far as they can, to help each other in sustaining the vicissitudes of life, and yet more in attending to their eternal salvation and in forming the inner man unto the fullness of the age of Christ.[39]

He thus points out a most important lesson for those who are about to enter marriage ; he holds out a norm by which one can judge whether he himself is fit to enter the married state, and whether the one to whom he has directed his attentions is a worthy choice. This norm is "Shall we be able to help each other to attain

[38] Pope Pius XI, *"Casti Connubii,"* AAS, 22 (1930), 584 f. : "magnam partem a debita coniugum pendent tam remota quam proxima ad matrimonium praeparatione." (PPt, p. 37.)

[39] *Ibid.,* 585 f. : "Bene igitur animati paratique, sponsi ad statum coniugii in eundem accedant, ut possint ea qua par est ope se mutuo iuvare in adversis vitae vicibus subeundis, multoque magis in aeterna salute procuranda et in interiore homine ad plentitudinem aetatis Christi (Eph. 4:13) conformando. . (PPt, p. 37.)

our eternal salvation in this state?" The measure of success one attains in living up to this norm, the answer to the question it asks, are dependent to a great extent on the amount of energy one expends in preparation for it. The Pope speaks first of the proximate preparation for marriage. He says:

> To the proximate preparation of a good married life belongs very specially the care in choosing a partner; on that depends a great deal whether the forthcoming marriage will be happy or not, since one may be to the other either a great help in leading a Christian life, or a great danger and hindrance. And so that they may not deplore for the rest of their lives the sorrows arising from an indiscreet marriage, those about to enter wedlock should carefully deliberate in choosing the person with whom henceforward they must live continually; they should, in so deliberating, keep before their minds the thought first of God and of the true religion of Christ, then of themselves, of their partner. . .40

The thought of God is to be foremost in their considerations. It should be their desire not only to ascertain their mutual love, but also to discover if this love will lead them to God. God, the Source of all love, must be one's first choice in the things that appertain to love. For love, to be true love, must always be directed towards God. As St. Augustine says: "We cannot love one another with true love, unless in turn we love God. For each one will love his neighbor as himself, if he loves God."41 Thus to direct love to a

40 *Ibid.*, 586 f.: "ad proximam vero boni matrimonii praeparationem maximopere pertinet eligendi coniugis studium; nam plurimum inde pendet utrum matrimonium felix futurum sit necne, cum alter coniux alteri aut magno adiutorio ad vitam Christiano modo in coniugio ducendam, aut magno periculo atque impedimento esse queat. Ne ergo inconsultae electionis poenas per totam vitam luere debeant, maturam sponsi deliberationem instituant antequam personam seligant, quacum deinde perpetuo sibi degendum erit; in hac vero deliberatione in primis rationem habeant Dei veraeque Christi religionis, deinde sui ipsius, alterius sponsi. . ." (PPt, p. 38.)

41 St. Augustine, *Tractatus LXXXVII in Joannis Evangelium,* Cap. 15:17-19 P.L. 35, 1852): Neque enim vera dilectione diligeremus invicem, nisi diligentis Deum. Diligit enim unusquisque proximum suum tamquam seipsum, si diligit Deum.

person, or to a thing, without at the same time directing it to God, would be a contradiction.

> God willed all things, and particularly the intelligent creature man, for no other end than that they might partake of His glory and His beatitude. That is as much to say that *all created activity is essentially and necessarily referred to God as to its end.* A thing that is made for God, by the mere fact that it acts, tends of its own spontaneity to God in virtue of a law written in the substance of its very being.[42]

Therefore, if love is not directed to God, or deflects a person from him, it cannot be said to be true. One great example of an untrue love in modern times is the love professed by a Catholic for one who is divorced. An investigation has shown that a marriage cannot take place. When the answer has been carried to the interested parties, frequently the reply is: "But we love each other, and since we are meant for each other, we know that God would want this marriage to go through," Obviously this is not God's wish, since such a marriage comes into conflict with one of God's laws: "He who marries a woman who has been put away from her husband commits adultery."[43] Since laws are the expression of the will of the lawmaker, it must be God's will that there be no marriage between the two people concerned. Therefore, the love that they perforce express for one another cannot be a true love.

If the two prospective partners wish to assure themselves of this direction to God, it would be well for them to keep in mind that which we have proposed as the object of conjugal love, i.e., the mutual sanctification of the spouses. It should be one of their chief considerations when making their choice. Was not this the mind of the Holy Father when he advised those about to enter the married state to attend more to their eternal salvation by forming the inner man unto the fulness of the age of Christ? Cath-

[42] Gilson, Etienne, *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy.* Trans, by A. H. C. Downes (New York: Scribner's, 1940), p. 273. (Italics mine.)

[43] Luke 16:18.

olics, jealous of their heritage, striving to gain some measure 01 success and happiness in this world, cannot but heed this salutary advice.

Besides this direction of their lives to God, the Holy Father advises them in the choice of a marriage partner to consider the true religion of Christ. No doubt he was referring to the necessity of choosing someone of the same religious beliefs and ideals, i.e., a Catholic. This advice cannot be taken lightly in view of the Church's prohibition of mixed marriages. This is a grave prohibition : "The Church most solemnly and everywhere forbids marriages between Catholics and persons in heretical or schismatic sects. If there is danger of perversion for the Catholic party and the offspring, such marriages are also forbidden by the divine law."[44] This logically leads to the question of the moral fitness of the actions of Catholics who are keeping company with non-Catholics, The question is well-asked ; "Is it correct *to* assert that a Catholic girl is guilty of grave sin if she begins to keep company with a non-Catholic, cherishing the hope that one day she will marry him?"[45] Summing up the answer we find that: "company-keeping with a view to marriage is gravely sinful unless it can be foreseen, at least with solid probability, that when the time of the marriage comes there will be a sufficient reason to justify the Catholic in taking the non-Catholic as his or her partner for life."[46][47] Therefore, those persons are guilty of grave sin unless they can foresee that reasons sufficient to allow the marriage to take place will be present. As Father F. Ter Haar expresses it: "With regard to the obligation of the penitent in this matter, it is certainly a grievous sin to begin company-keeping with a view to a future marriage with a non-Catholic if the Catholic has no weighty reason for it, and the only motive is a blind love and a

[44] *Codex Iuris Canonici,* Canon 1060 : "Severissime Ecclesia ubique prohibet ne matrimonium ineatur inter duas personas baptizatas, quarum altera sit catholica, altera vero sectae haereticae seu schismaticae adscripta ; quod si adsit perversionis periculum coniugis catholici et prolis, coniugium ipsa etiam lege divina vetatur,"

[45] Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., "The Problem of Mixed Marriages," TAER, 115 (1946), p. 386.

[48] *Ibid.*

strong mutual affection/'[47]. The reasons must be grave. What may,be a grave reason? Father Connell proposes a case where such a grave reason would exist, he., where such a marriage offers a widow the only means of keeping her children with her and rearing them as Catholics.[48] Another reason, one more commonly proposed, is the well-founded hope that the non-Catholic party will be converted. Having foreseen this with some probability, the Catholic is allowed *per se* to keep company with the non-Catholic. But how often is this condition actually borne out at the time the company-keeping starts? Rather it would seem that the well-founded hope, if it would arise at all, would arise late in courtship, when the example of the Catholic has had sufficient time to take its effect. So rarely will a Catholic be able to take advantage of this condition. It is important to note that the Church may have a sufficient reason for granting a dispensation, which does not constitute a sufficient reason for the Catholic party to contract the marriage. Such, for example, is the reason (so often alleged in petitions for a dispensation), "danger of a civil marriage" or "danger of apostasy."[40] Thus it would not be permitted a Catholic to keep company with a non-Catholic, if in so doing he would place himself in the position where he would say: "I am going to take a chance on arriving at a state of mind (or heart) where I shall leave the Church if what I want to do is not allowed me."[50] For such an attitude would be gravely sinful.

Several minor causes are also advanced to justify company-keeping. Among these the one most often advanced is the lack of sufficient Catholics who would qualify as prospective mates. In seeking to determine if this could be classified as a valid and sufficiently grave reason for company-keeping, our only hope is recourse to the Church herself. Our precedent is the canonical causes which the Church advances as reasons for granting dispensations.

[47] Ter Haar, Francis, C.SS.R., *Mixed Marriages and Their Remedies.* Trans, by A. Walter, C.SS.R.; ed. by F. J. Connell, C.SS.R.; (New York: Pustet, 1933), p. 129.

[48] Connell, *op cit.,* p. 387.

[48] *Ibid.*

[0] Ernest F. Miller, C.SS.R., "Mixed Company Keeping," HPR, 41 (1941), p. 1075.

We can note these pertinent statements of Father Joseph A. Quigley:

> The following Canonical Causes are of a private nature which affect the good of individuals, and they, therefore, do not suffice of themselves for dispensations from Mixed Religion and Disparity of Cult. . . . They are nevertheless placed here under the general heading of primary causes because they can be grave reasons for some dispensations.[61][62]

Among these causes he then lists the one of which we are speaking, *Angustia Loci.* Basing our judgment upon this statement, it is our opinion that mixed company-keeping would have to be forbidden if lack of sufficient Catholics is the *only* reason that can be alleged for carrying it on. However, if circumstances or other reasons would combine with it to render it sufficiently grave, the practice may be permitted.

It is interesting to note, in connection with what we have said above, the statement of Father Miller that: "The Church does not consider 'love' a grave and sufficient reason for granting a dispensation. 'Love' then cannot be considered a grave and sufficient reason in itself for continuing the courtship."[52] The foundation on which he bases his stand is the fact that "love as a mere physical attraction is too unstable a foundation on which to build such a home as Christ intended."[53] We may notice that here he limits love to the meaning of mere physical attraction. It is in this sense that Ter Haar also rejects love as a reason for granting a dispensation: "Still less could one regard as a sufficient reason: that blind, passionate love, with which two persons are inordinately fond of each other, that type of affection that is uncontrolled by faith and reason, and gives no guarantee for its future stability."[64] However, it may be said that even true love, one in

[61] Quigley, Joseph A., *Matrimonial Impediments and Dispensations* (2nd ed. Philadelphia: The Dolphin Press, 1942), pp, 11-12.

[62] Miller, *op. cit.,* p. 1076.

[63] *Ibid.,* p. 1077.

[64] Ter Haar, *op. cit.,* p. 65.

which the spiritual qualities predominate, has a certain instability about it, which could cause it to be rejected as a sufficient reason of itself for the granting of a dispensation. Father Ivo Zeiger, S.J., pointed this out only too clearly when he declared that the essence of marriage is not to be placed in conjugal love alone;

> Thence it is clear that the essence of marriage is not to be placed in conjugal love alone, but there is required over and above another element, a certain guard of fluctuating affection, firm and stable, independent of the wavering movement of the senses, by which the giving of the spouses may be estabished and strengthened. It is, namely, the juridical, matrimonial bond.[65]

Finally, it must be pointed out in this instance that this love, though strengthened by the bond of marriage, will not have the total stability of which it is capable. For it will not be strengthened by a bond which will produce its effects at *full* capacity due to the presence of the non-Catholic party.

A final consideration on this point for the Catholic would be the prospective losses to which he would be exposing himself in marrying a non-Catholic. These are losses in the supernatural order. For the Catholic these should evoke special consideration since the object of Christian conjugal love is the sanctification of one's partner. Apropos of this Vermeersch warns of the dangers of this type of marriage because of "the greater difficulty of fulfilling the task of mutual sanctification. . ,"[50] There would also be the loss of a great number of graces. If the non-Catholic chanced to be unbaptized, there would be the loss, first of all, of those graces usually attached to a sacramental marriage. This[55]

[55] Ivo Zeiger, S.J., "Nova Definitio Matrimonii," *Periodica De Re Morali, Canonica, Liturgica,* 20 (1931), p, 45*: "Inde patet essentiam matrimonii reponendam non esse in solo amore coniugali, sed requiri aliud insuper elementum, praesidium quoddam fluctuantis affectus, firmum et stabile, a labili sensuum motu independens, quo traditio coniugum roboretur atque confirmetur, Quod est vinculum iuridicum matrimoniale"; cf. also: Farrell, Walter, O.P., **J** *Companion to the Summa* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1945), IV, p. 397.

[50] Vermeersch, *M'hat Is Marriage?* p, 63.

would mean not only a loss of sacramental grace, but also a loss of those graces given in sacramental matrimony in view of the particular difficulties attached to marriage.[57] Secondly, there would be the loss of those actual graces given especially for the fulfillment of the marital duties, but given only at the specific request of the spouses.[58] Even if the non-Catholic were baptized, undoubtedly there would still be the loss of a great number of graces due to the fact that opportunities of this kind will not be seized as quickly or as readily as when one has a Catholic for a spouse. There will be other losses besides the losses in the spiritual order. For example, there will be wanting that harmony which is attainable in a much greater degree in a strictly Catholic marriage. As Pope Pius XI warned: "Where there exists diversity of mind, truth and feeling, the bond of union of mind and heart is wont to be broken, or at least weakened. From this comes the danger lest the love of man and wife grow cold and the peace and happiness of family life, resting as it does on the union of hearts be destroyed."[59] And as Ter Haar even more emphatically points out: "Now this intimate union and harmony of souls, which is necessary in the daily intercourse of life, is greatly impaired and in fact can hardly exist, especially between Christians, unless they are united by the bond of the same religion."[60] Vermeersch commenting upon this problem adds: "For the *parties themselves,* a less complete accord of thought, sentiment and action, flowing from the fundamental disagreement on the question of religion."[61] So from all sides we see the Church warning Catholics away from such marriages, and the conditions that lead to them. Her view of company-keeping[62]

[57] Martindale, C. C., S.J., *Wedlock* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1937), pp. 39-40.

[58] Vermeersch, *What Is Marriage?* p. 29.

[59] Pope Pius XI, *"Casti Connubii,"* AAS, 22 (1930), 571 f.: "Nam distrahi solet aut saltem relaxari animorum vinculum, ubi in rebus ultimis et suminis, quas homo veneratur, idest in religionis veritatibus et sensibus, dissimilitudo mentium habetur et voluntatum intercedit diversitas. Ex quo periculum est, ne langueat inter coniuges caritas, itemque labefactetur domesticae societatis pax et felicitas, quae ex cordium potissimum unitate proficiscitur."

[60] Ter Haar, *op. cit.,* p. 14.

[61] Vermeersch, *What Is Marriage?* p. 63.

is that of tolerance under certain stipulations—prohibition if these stipulations are not met. It is true that if we view the situation as it stands, there is a widespread disregard of the Church's attitude toward mixed company-keeping. This is due not so much to the disobedience of her subjects, as to their ignorance of her teachings. This, of course, prevents many courtships, objectively sinful, from becoming subjectively so. Only when definite measures are taken to instruct Catholics on the stand they should take toward this type of friendship, will this ignorance be wiped out. Perhaps then will mixed marriages, the source of so many defections from the faith, cease from exacting their heavy toll.

Next to the thought of God and religion in the choice of a partner comes the consideration of the partner. Undoubtedly the quality which should most influence the selection of one over another should be the moral worth of that person. As a matter of fact this is proven in practice. Tabulation of the results of a test in which a group of collegians were asked to rate the qualifications expected in the one they hoped to marry showed that the men ranked this qualification first, while the women ranked it second.[82] Father H. Noldin, S.J., also points this out when he considers the reasons underlying the necessity of an engagement period. He says that this is necessary "in order that each might test the character and the disposition of the other . . . and if it is shown that the marriage would result in unhappiness, this would be a sufficient reason for the termination of the engagement."[83] The determination of moral worth for the most part resolves itself into a question of chastity. The more deeply such a virtue is embedded in a person, the more highly qualified he may be said to be in so far as true moral worth is concerned. Even such an authority as Alexis Carrel declares: "Before marriage, the ideal

[82] Cooper, John M., *Religion Outlines For Colleges* (2nd ed., rev. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic Education Press, 1941), IV, pp. 94-96.

[83] H. Noldin, S.J., and A. Schmitt, S.J., *Summa Theologiae Moralis* (26th ed. Ratisbon: Rauch, 1940), III, p. 533. "(Rationes, ob quas matrimonio praemitti soleant sponsalia, sunt) ut alter indolem et mores alterius interim experiatur ... et si inde constaret matrimonium infelicem exitum habiturum esse, haec praevisio sufficiens ratio esset recedendi a sponsalibus. . ."

state is chastity. Chastity requires early moral training. It is the highest expression of self-discipline. Voluntary restraint from the sex act during youth, more than any other moral and physical effort, enhances the quality of life."[64] If chastity is maintained in such a close association as courtship by its very nature implies, it not only indicates the true moral fibre of the parties concerned, but also it points to what their conduct in marriage will be, and, of course, the resulting happiness that may be expected. Unchastity on the part of one, however, lowers the esteem in which he has been held, and very often leads to his rejection as a suitable marriage partner. And, too, as Vermeersch states, it not only renders present constancy unstable, but also endangers future felicity and happiness.[65] Pope Pius XI remarks: "There is danger that those who before marriage sought in all things what is theirs, who indulged even their impure desires, will be in the married state what they were before, they will reap that which they have sown."[66] Leclercq reaffirms this when he declares: "How many marriages are not, as it were, doomed in advance because the partners, in most cases the husband, have lost their power of enthusiasm in the quest of pleasure prior to marriage."[67] Inasmuch, therefore, as one's own happiness in marriage will depend in large measure on the choice of a satisfactory partner, that choice should be made to depend largely upon the ability of the prospective partner to measure up to the standards required of a good moral character.

Again, in the selection of a partner, those preparing for marriage ought to be warned of the fallacy and danger that lies in basing their choice on the purely physical charms of their intended spouses. Such a quality is deceiving, and not at all,

[64] Alexis Carrel, "Married Love," *The Reader's Digest,* 35, No. 207 (1939), p. 13.

[65] Vermeersch, *Theologia Moralis,* IV, p. 17.

[66] Pope Pius XI, *"Casti Connubii,"* AAS, 22 (1930), 584 f.: "Nam qui ante in omnibus seipsos et sua quaesiere, qui suis cupiditatibus indulgebant, timendum est, ne iîdem in matrimonio taies iuturi sint quales ante matrimonium fuerint; item id tandem metere debeant quod seminaverint. . ." (PPt, p. 37.)

[67] Leclercq, *op. cit.,* p. 103.

as some seem to think, an infallible indication of a noble character. As we have seen previously, "it is concerned with qualities which are pleasing to the senses, and which are changeable and of slight importance—whence the love thus arising is vain and inconstant."[88] To base it on this quality alone is to foredoom marriage to failure. This is the opinion of Dr. Verner Moore. After a series of studies made upon this quality, he came to the conclusion that:

> There is a tendency for sexual charm to lead the human mind to a belief in the value of the personality that exerts the charm. Hence the danger of precipitous marriage based on love at first sight. Mental hygiene points to the importance of a deep knowledge of the personality before marriage is seriously contemplated.[88]

In confirmation of this fact we have but to look and see about us the emphasis that the world attaches to sex. Then, in turn, we should consider the number of divorces that are granted in this country. A great many of them are due to the fact that a partner was chosen purely on the basis of physical attraction. The remedy is entrance into marriage on a sound basis. This requires a love on the part of the man and woman that will embrace their spiritual as well as their physical qualities. After all they are human beings endowed with the faculties of intellect and will. Confronted with a choice upon which will depend much of their temporal and spiritual happiness, it should become evident to them not only what use they should make of these faculties in preparing their selection, but also what importance they should attach to the presence of these qualities in the partner whom they are selecting.

Lastly, Pope Pius XI speaks of the remote preparation for marriage. To this preparation belongs the period of childhood and adolescence. "For it cannot be denied that the basis of a happy wedlock, and the ruin of an unhappy one, are prepared and

[88] *Supra,* p. 6.

[88] Moore, Thomas V., O.S.B., *Personal Mental Hygiene* (New York: Grune & Stratton, 1944), p, 137.

set in the souls of boys and girls during the period of childhood and adolescence/'™ Even in such a far-off period as childhood, the boy and girl are preparing for marriage, remote though that preparation may be. For during this period childish whims are overcome, and the child learns the necessity of obedience. His actions, trifling as they are, are being carefully directed- Slowly that will-power is born which is to be the backbone of a young man's or young woman's character. The Holy Father when speaking of this sees fit to recall certain remarks which he had previously made in his encyclical on Education :

> The inclinations of the will, if they are bad, must be repressed from childhood, but such as are good must be fostered, and the mind, particularly of children, should be imbued with doctrines which begin with God, while the heart should be strengthened with the aids of divine grace, in absence of which, no one can curb evil desires, nor can his discipline and formation be brought to complete perfection by the Church.7l0

E. R. Moore, dwelling on much the same thoughts but applying them to a more advanced period of life, states;

> If from childhood the two who are now husband and wife have accustomed themselves to order their lives according to fixed and definite standards of right and wrong, then self-control is already a habit. If they have always endeavored—though perhaps, indeed, not always successfully—to do right and avoid wrong, even in the little things of life, when they come to the big things they

70 Pope Pius XI, *"Casti Connubit,"* AAS, 22 (1930), *584* f.; "Illud enim negari non potest, felicis coniugii firmum fundamentum, et infelicis ruinam, iam pueritiae et iuventutis tempore puerorum puellarumque animis instrui ac poni." (PPt, p. 37.)

71 *Ibid-,* 585 f.: "A pueritia igitur voluntatis inclinationes, si pravae, cohibendae, sin autem bonae, promovendae sunt, ac praesertim puerorum mens imbuatur doctrinis a Deo profectis et animus divinae gratiae auxiliis roboretur oportet, quae si defuerint, nec suis quisque moderari cupiditatibus poterit neque ad absolutionem perfectionemque disciplina atque informatio ab Ecclesia adduci (Litt. Encyc. Divini Illius Magistri, 31 Dec. 1929)/'

> will be prepared. . . Mastery over self is not readily won, it is a life-work.[72]*

Childhood is thus a preparation also. If good habits are formed during that period, and then are carried into the period of adolescence and beyond, they constitute a certain bulwark for the protection and success of marriage. We have already seen somewhat the necessity of chastity prior to marriage. But that takes its beginnings from the child's earliest days when he is taught the first rudiments of modesty and purity. Father Edgar Schmiedler, O.S.B,. declares:

> From earliest years children are prepared for the faithful observance of this law. They are consistently taught that any deliberate violation of the virtue of chastity in thought, word and deed is seriously wrong. . . The powerful instinct itself is curbed and given no opportunity to get the upper hand over the higher and more spiritual side of life. . . Thus the individual is prepared for the period of storm and stress that normally comes with the emergence of manhood and womanhood at adolescence, as well as for the normal hazards of courtship.[74]

Childhood thus assumes an important role in marriage, but a role which may be easily overlooked. It is only when one is forced to seek out the reasons for success in marriage that the prominence that childhood plays is brought to light. It is then revealed as the basis for the spirit of chastity that is so vital if such success is to be achieved.

In concluding this chapter we cannot but stress the need for heeding the words of the Holy Father on the great necessity of preparation for marriage. It imposes on those who would embark upon such a task a grave responsibility. Leclercq states that: "he who marries thoughtlessly runs the great risk of founding a home

n Moore, Edward R., *The Case Against Birth Control* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1931), p. 314.

M Schmiedler, Edgar, O S.B., *An Introductory Study of the Family* (New York: Century, 1930, p. 314.

that will turn out to be a failure, and he is guilty of an imprudent act which may, unless it be justified on other grounds, amount to a grave sin."[74]*We are primarily inclined to adopt the views of this author because of the attention which Pope Pius XI devoted to this subject in his Encyclical. We think it a wise choice in view of the failure of numerous wartime marriages—marriages which failed because they were entered without sufficient knowledge or thought of the duties of this noble state of life. Our present Pontiff, Pope Pius XII, in an allocution addressed to a Women's Catholic Action Group, alluded to this problem. He lamented the fact that so many young men and young women rushed into marriage without a thought of preparation for their task as educators. It seems to us that it would not be inappropriate to extend this idea to the whole field of preparation for marriage. Thus he declares:

> It is a curious circumstance and, as Pope Pius XI remarked in his Encyclical, a lamentable one, that whereas no one would dream of suddenly becoming a mechanic *or an engineer, a doctor or a* lawyer, without any apprenticeship or preparation, yet every day there are numbers of young men and women who marry without having given an instant's thought to preparing themselves. . .[76]

A very great help to these young people in their preparation will be the stimulus afforded by the institution of proper courses on marriage in the schools, especially in the high-schools.[78] These

[74] Leclercq, *op. cit.,* p. 52.

[v] Pope Pius XII, *"Allocutio mulieribus ab Actione Catholica earumque adiutricibus,»* AAS, 33 (1941), 451 f.: "Ora—vedete cosa strana, che anche Pio XI lamentava nella sua Enciclica—, mentre non verrebbe in mente a *nessuno* di farsi subito li per li, senza tirocinio nè preparazione, operaio meccanico o ingegnere, medico o awocato, ogni giorno non pochi giovani uomini e giovani donne si spasano e uniscono senza aver pensato un instante a prepararsi agli ardui doveri che ei attendono nell'educazione du figli."; cf. also, Naughton, James W., S.J., *Pius XII On World Problems* (New York: The America Press, 1943), pp. 89-90.

[76] Schiniedler, Edgar, O.S.B., *Marriage and the Family* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1946), viii.

would serve to instill in them a sense of responsibility for the offices they will have to undertake, and afford them a knowledge of the foundations on which they should build their marriage. In a more detailed explanation than we have attempted, they could be instructed on the nature of love, the necessity for its proper direction, the rights and duties, the purposes of marriage, and finally upon the nature of conjugal love *itself. The* knowledge obtained, plus the increased awareness to the duties and the responsibilities that are entailed in marriage, will serve to temper youth's impetuosity and arouse him to the necessity of undertaking the proper preparation for marriage.

Having considered the nature of pre-marital love and its importance in the preparation for marriage, we proceed now to the actual consideration of this love's proper term, Le., conjugal love. In studying the notion of conjugal love we will discuss in our first article its nature, and in succeeding articles, its qualities, its necessity, its effects on the spouses, its relation to the conjugal act, and finally its relation to the child.

CHAPTER II

The Notion of Conjugal Love

ARTICLE I. THE NATURE OF CONJUGAL LOVE

> This conjugal faith, however, which is most aptly called by St. Augustine the "faith of chastity" blooms more freely, more beautifully and more nobly, when it is rooted in that more excellent soil, the love of husband and wife which pervades all the duties of married life and holds pride of place in Christian marriage?[1]

In these words our late Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, assigned to conjugal love its importance in the constitution of marriage. It is worthy of note that he gives to it the "pride of place" in Christian marriage. He does not make it the primary purpose of marriage, but rather he pronounces it the fundamental principle or spirit which should pervade all the duties of married life. In other words it should be the quality which characterizes all the actions of the spouses toward each other. They ought not to be motivated in their relations by a blind selfishness, wherein each will seek as much as he can for himself. Rather, with a proper appreciation of the meaning of love, they ought to surrender themselves to the task of loving the other for the good that will benefit the beloved. In striving to accomplish this, almost without realization of what they have done, they will regain a hundred-fold the love they have given. As Father M. C. D'Arcy, S.J., has expressed it:

> Love is in being disinterested most perfect humanly. A lover is living at the highest pitch of his selfhood when

[1] Pope Pius XI, *"Casti Connubii,"* AAS, *22* (1930), 547 f.: "Haec autem, quae a Sancto Augustino aptissime appellatur *castitatis fides,* et facilior et multo etiam iucundior ac nobilior efflorescet ex altero capite praestantissimo: ex coniugali scilicet amore, qui omnia coniugalis vitae officia pervadit et quemdam tenet in Christiano coniugio principatum nobilitatis." (PPt, pp. 7-8.)

> he forgets himself to think only of the beloved. As Gilson finely says: "Love seeks no recompense; did it do so it would at once cease to be love. But neither should it be asked to renounce joy in the possession of the thing loved; love would no longer be love if it renounced its accompanying joy. Thus all true love is at once disinterested and rewarded, or let us say rather that it could not be rewarded unless it were disinterested, because disinterestedness is its very essence."[2]

Their love should be a surrender of self in the interest of the one loved. Having accomplished this the reward will come as a natural result. If this spirit characterizes their lives, an ensuing harmony will be developed which will best tide them over the trials and difficulties which are the lot of even the most happily-married. It is for this reason that the Holy Father sees fit to give *love the* "pride of place" in Christian marriage. For as it permeates the fulfillment of their cares and duties, it likewise contributes to their mutual enrichment and happiness.

The standard for the love of husbands and wives is found in Sacred Scripture in the words of the Apostle of the Gentiles to the Ephesians:

> Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for her, that he might sanctify her. . . Even thus ought husbands to love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his own wife, loves himself. For no one ever hated his own flesh; on the contrary he nourishes and cherishes it, as Christ also does the Church. . ?

Husbands and wives are given a model—the Divine Master Himself. He who is the model of meekness, patience, humility, kindness and sanctity, is also the model of human love. As Christ has loved his Church, so also is a husband to love his wife. But Christ loved his Church with an especially pure and holy love. A lofty example is thus set for the husband, but the achievement of such[3]

[3] M. C. D'Arcy, *S.J., The Mind and Heart of Love (New York:* Henry Holt & Co., 1947), p. 99.

[a] Eph. 5:25-26; 28-29.

a goal is placed within his grasp. "Christ Himself the institutor and perfecter of the venerable sacraments, merited by his Passion on our behalf the grace which should perfect the natural love of marriage, render the union indissoluble, and sanctify the married pair."[4] Christ, in this sense, is not merely the Model, but the Channel who affords the help necessary that the husband may attain this new level of love, upon which his eyes are now set. Love, when conceived in this light, as an elevation to a supernatural status, assumes a position of surpassing importance. Because of its function as the spirit characterizing the fulfillment of the marital rights and duties, its newly-found vitality gives to marriage a help sorely needed.

Before we attempt a treatment of the notion of conjugal love, it is necessary first to locate it in its position in the structure of marriage. In speaking of marriage here, we are referring to it as *matrimonium in facto esse,* i.e., as the perpetual and exclusive union of a man and woman, which has arisen from their mutual consent *(matrimonium in fieri)* and is ordained primarily to the procreation and education of offspring.[5] This in turn necessitates an understanding of the terms primary and secondary end as they refer to marriage (we have already defined these terms as they apply generally[6]). The primary and secondary ends are divisions of the *"finis opens."* In marriage the *"finis operis"* is made up of those goods towards whose attainment matrimony tends of of its nature, this having been given to it when God the author of

[4] Concilium Tridentinum, Sessio 24. "Gratiam vero, quae naturalem illum amorem perficeret, et indissolubilem unitatem confirmaret, coniugesque sanctificaret, ipse Christus, venerabilium sacramentorum institutor atque perfector, sua nobis passione promeruit." *Canones et Decreta Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Tridentini* (Ratisbonne: G. J. Manz, 1903), pp. 135-136.

[5] Cappello, Felix M., S.J., *Tractatus Canonico-Moralis de Sacramentis,* V, p. 3: "Unio legitima viri ac mulieris perpetua et exclusiva, ex mutuo ipsorum consensu orta, ad sobolem procreandam atque educandam ordinata." Cappello distinguishes the matrimonium *in fieri* in this manner: Consideratum *in fieri* seu active aut causaliter, est contractus quo initur et constituitur coniugalis societas; consideratum *in facto esse,* seu passive aut formaliter, est ipsa unio coniugalis, i.e., status seu vinculum matrimonii tamquam effectus e coniugali contractu dimanans."

[6] *Supra,* p. 5.

nature instituted it? Of these goods or ends, the end toward which matrimony is primarily directed and to which the other *"fines operis"* are subordinate, is the procreation and education of children. In confirmation of this we have the statement of Pope Pius XI as expressed in his encyclical on Christian Marriage. In his statement he makes his own the words of the Code of Canon Law. We quote it in its context:

> Since, however, We have spoken fully elsewhere on the Christian education of youth, let Us sum it all up by quoting once more the words of St. Augustine: "As regards the offspring it is provided that they should be begotten lovingly and educated religiously,"—and this is also expressed succinctly in the Code of Canon Law—"The primary end of marriage is the procreation and education of children."[7]

The Angelic Doctor, St. Thomas Aquinas, declares: "The essential cause of marriage is the end to which it is by its very nature ordained. And this is always good, namely the begetting of children. . ."[9] The secondary ends are mutual help and the remedy of concupiscence.[10] The relation of primary to secondary is not decided by the "essentialness" of the ends, for all three are essential to marriage[11]; but the one is primary because it is more fundamental than the others.[12] By God's intention procreation has the greatest importance. In its concept procreation and education of children contains the concept of mutual help, whereas the reverse

[7] The Sacred Roman Rota, AAS, 36 (1944), 184 f.: "'Finis operis' in matrimonio est illud bonum in quod obtinendum matrimonium tendit ex natura sua, quam Deus Creator instituto matrimonio indidit."

[8] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 546 f.: "Cum autem de Christiana iuventutis educatione alias copiose egerimus, haec omnia nunc iteratis Sancti Augustini verbis complectamur: "In prole (attenditur), ut amanter suscipiatur . . . religiose educetur"; quod quidem ipsum in Codice iuris canonici quoque nervose edicitur: "Matrimonii finis primarius est procreatio atque educatio prolis." (PPt, p. 6.)

[9] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae,* III (Suppi.), q. 48, a. 2. "Per se quidem causa matrimonii est, ad quam matrimonium est de se ordinatum: et haec semper bona est, scilicet procreatio prolis. . ."

[10] Cappello, *op. cit.,* p. 8.

[11] John C. Ford, S.J., "Marriage: Its Meaning and Purposes," p. 369.

[12] *Ibid.,* p. 370.

is not true.[13] Mutual help, if considered *in se,* i.e., between any two persons, is not confined to marriage. It only becomes proper to marriage—it only becomes specified—when it becomes distinguished by its internal relation to the primary end of procreation and education of children. In certain instances, where procreation is or cannot be realized, mutual help takes on a certain independence inasmuch as it is the end which is actually realized.[14] It might be well to note in this connection that those who are about to enter marriage do not have to intend explicitly the primary end in order to make their marriage valid. As long as they do not exclude this end explicitly, they may intend either of the secondary ends or for that matter any other honest end that is compatible with the essential notion of marriage.[15] This does not mean either that all of the ends of marriage will be realized, e.g., the realization of the primary end that children will be born. For as Ford says: "They are not bound ordinarily, in individual cases, to realize the primary end of marriage. This is another way of saying that the use of marriage must be subordinated to the primary end *per se* only in the sense that no positive interference with the primary end is permitted."[16] If, as in the ordinary case, they accept marriage as it stands, accepting whatever obligations or privileges it may bring, then by this general intention they are implicitly choosing the primary end, and thus fulfill the requirements for a valid marriage.

In classifying conjugal love we place it under the secondary end of mutual help. Certain authors when they treat of mutual help say nothing explicitly of the place of conjugal love. This is not to say that they do not make conjugal love a secondary end or

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] The Sacred Roman Rota, *op. cit.,* 193 f.: "Finis secundarius habet quandam independentiam, eatenus videlicet quatenus in personis coniugum verificari et ad effectum perduci potest iis quoque in casibus, in quibus assecutio finis primarii impeditur, sive ad tempus sive in perpetuum."

[15] Merkelbach, B., O.P., *Summa Theologiae Moralis,* III, p. 757.

[16] Ford, *op. cit.,* p. 369. (This statement of Father Ford must be adapted to the doctrine of Pope Pius XII. In an address to the Italian Catholic Union of Midwives on Oct. 29, 1951, Pius XII stated in reference to the practice of "Rhythm" that those married couples who make use of their marriage rights must contribute towards the conservation of the human race unless they have a serious reason to the contrary.)

part of a secondary end of marriage. But we are to understand by this that they include the notion of conjugal love implicitly.[17] On the other hand, however, we have authors who explicitly include conjugal love in the notion of mutual help or place it in apposition with it.[18] Ford reports the common opinion when he states :

> Now, although there may be some doubt of the extent of the concept "mutual help," there is no doubt that it includes the idea of conjugal love. Both theologians and canonists explain mutual love as a part of mutual help, or mutual help as a part of mutual love. Cappello, for instance, says that the secondary end of marriage, essential and intrinsic to it, is mutual help, "not only in the care of the household but especially in mutual love." And thus the authors generally.[19]

At the least then, we can say that conjugal love is such that it belongs to the nature of a secondary end. Aertnys-Damen indicate this when they say: "This union, this conjugal love inasmuch as it is to be nourished in accordance with the intention of nature, is also an end but not the ultimate end of marriage."[20] Personally we would include it in the concept of mutual help, since we believe that mutual help is the more generic term in its connotation. The statement of the Sacred Roman Rota of June 26, 1944, would be a confirmation of our view. It mentions explicitly that the secondary end of matrimony is "mutual help."[21] This term em-

[17] St. Thomas Aquinas, *op. cit.,* q. 41, a. 1, corp.; Payen, G., S.J., *De Matrimonio* (ZI-KA-WEI: T'OU-SE WE, 1935), I, p. 62; Gasparri, P., *Tractatus Canonicus De Matrimonio* (9th ed., Rome: Vatican, 1932), I, p. 18 ; Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 742 ; H. Noldin, S.J., and A, Schmitt, S.J., *Summa Theologicae Moralis,* III, p. 511.

[18] Thus: P. Wernz, S.J., and P. Vidal, S.J., *Jus Canonicum* (3rd ed. by A. Aguiree, S.J. (Rome: Gregorian University, 1946), V, p. 31; Cappello, *op. cit.,* p. 8.

[19] Ford, *op. cit.,* pp. 362-363.

[20] J. Aertnys, C.SS.R., and C. A. Damen, C.SS.R., *Theologia Moralis* (14th ed., Turin: Marietti, 1944), II, p. 470: "Haec unio, hic amor conjugalis quatenus ex naturae intentione fovendus est, etiam finis sed non ultimus matrimonii est. .

[21] The Sacred Roman Rota, *op. cit.,* 187 f.

braces many things. Among others it speaks of this as being expressed as "help in psychic and somatic exigencies."[22] Possibly love would be included under the term "psychic." At any rate we would never attempt to make conjugal love the primary end of marriage, as certain theologians have recently attempted to do. Speaking of these in a recent decree on the ends of marriage, the Holy Office declared: "In their treatises a distinct primary end of matrimony is designated by them, e.g..... the mutual love and union of the spouses which is to be strengthened and perfected through the psychic and somatic surrender of their persons. . ."[23] To bring us to a realization of the possible evils inherent in the doctrine of these theologians, the Congregation, in continuing its statement, warned: "This new manner of thinking and speaking is naturally constituted for the nurturing of errors and uncertainties,"[24] Finally, to correct this mistaken notion, it states in a declaration that takes the form of an answer to a doubt, that the opinion of recent writers could not be admitted, which either denies that the primary end of matrimony is the procreation and education of children, or teaches that the secondary ends are not essentially subordinate, but equally principal and independent.[25]

The notion of conjugal love is also connected with the blessing of conjugal fidelity. Pope Pius XI expresses their inter-relation when he says:

> This conjugal faith, however, which is most aptly called by St. Augustine the "faith of chastity" blooms more

[22] Ibid.

[23] Congregatio S. Officii, AAS, 36 (1944), 103 f.: "Hisce in elucubrationibus primarius coniugii finis alius ab aliis designatur, ut, e.g.: ... coniugum mutuus amor atque unio fovenda ac perficienda per psychicam et somaticam propriae personae traditionem. .

"Novatus hic cogitandi et loquendi modus natus *est* ad errores et incertitudines fovendas. . .

albid.: "quibus avertendis prospicientes Emi ac Revmi Patres huius Supremae Sacrae Congregationis . . . proposito sibi dubio: 'An admitti possit quorundam recentiorum sententia, qui vel negant finem primarium matrimonii esse prolis generationem et educationem, vel docent fines secundarios non esse essentialiter subordinates, sed esse aeque principales et independentes'; respondendum decreverunt: *Negative"*

> freely, more beautifully and more nobly, when it is rooted in that more excellent soil, the love of husband and wife which pervades all the duties of married life and holds pride of place in Christian marriage.[20]

In this statement the Holy Father sets forth the effect of love on fidelity. Its effect is this: Unless fidelity is rooted in love, unless fidelity is penetrated by the spirit which love connotes, it will not attain that full-flowering or full perfection of which it is capable. In other words, fidelity, being the more fundamental notion, can be achieved without love. But as the Holy Father declares, it will "bloom more freely and more beautifully" when it is rooted in love. On the other hand, the effect of fidelity on love will be this, as the Pontiff declares in his very next sentence. "(It) demands that husband and wife be joined in an especially pure and holy love, not as adulterers love each other, but as Christ loved the Church."[27] Fidelity thus acts as a control or check on love, directing it to its proper end, and preventing it from being affected by anything that might deter it from that end. It seems rather evident then, that for the attainment of the best results, both *for fidelity* and for love, there should be the greatest possible inter-relation between the two. For the perfection which they hope to attain will depend upon the degree of cooperation that is actually achieved between them.

We begin our treatment proper of the nature of conjugal love by turning first to an examination of those definitions of it already proferred. The first definition is that given by Franz Walter:

> The Church sees in married love the mutual attraction of the two sexes implanted by the Creator in human nature, and the foundation of and indispensable condition for the most intimate and the indissoluble com-

[20] Pope Pius XI, *op, cit.,* 547 f.: "Haec autem, quae a Sancto Augustino aptissime appellatur *castitatis fides,* et facilior et multo etiam iucundior ac nobilior efflorescet ex altero capite praestantissimo: ex coniugali scilicet amore, qui omnia coniugalis vitae officia pervadit et quemdam tenet in christiano coniugio principatum nobilitatis." (PPt, pp. 7-8.)

[27] *Ibid.:* "Postulat praeterea matrimonii fides ut vîr et uxor singulari quodam sanctoque ac puro amore coniuncti sint; neque ut adulteri inter se ament, sed ut Christus dilexit Ecclesiam. .

> munity of life between human beings of different sex, and as such gives it her blessing.[28]

We do not believe that this is an accurate definition of conjugal love. It is true enough as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. It is an incomplete definition. Conjugal love is much more than a mere attraction between the sexes. It is a love which effects a union between husband and wife. Dietrich Von Hildebrand, from whose work the definition of Franz Walter was taken, does not give a specific definition of conjugal love; however, he describes it sufficiently to enable us to grasp the meaning he intends :

> But the specific quality not only of love as such, but of wedded love in particular, is independent of the physical aspect of sex. What distinguishes wedded love from other kinds of love—for example, love of parents or children or the love between two friends—is the quality of the love itself, the distinctive correlation between two persons, the completion of both parties, which only this kind of love affects, and that unique splendour which invests "being in love" in the noble sense. It is impossible to reduce all this to so-called sex instinct.[29]

We think this statement indicates a fundamental disagreement with our own position on the specific difference of conjugal love. We wish here merely to call attention to the disagreement, and will leave further consideration to the body of the thesis.

The definition given by Ford is at once the clearest and yet the simplest. He states that: "Conjugal love is the virtue by which man and wife wish to communicate to one another the benefits proper to marriage,"[30] Zeiger expands and develops this definition. He states :

> We understand conjugal love as a virtue by which one spouse sincerely adheres to the other, showing rever-

• Waiter, Franz, *"Dcr Leib und sein Hecht in Christentum* (Donauworth, 1910), Part 1, c. 2, iii, p. 154, quoted in Dietrich Von Hildebrand, *In Defense of Purity* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1935), p. 19.

wVon Hildebrand, *op. cit.,* pp. 18-19.

80 Ford, *op. cit.,* p. 356.

> ence for him and preserving fidelity, cherishes him, aids him, so that joined in mutual charity and patience they form a new principle, morally one, upon which the whole conjugal life, the most grave duties of procreation and education of offspring can be securely built.[81]

To these definitions we wish to add our own; we think it may express more clearly the nature of conjugal love. It is this: "Conjugal love is that virtue which effects a union of husband and wife by which they wish to give to each other the marital benefits." We will consider this definition in each of its parts. First, *it is a virtue,* i.e., an essentially good operative habit, that gives both the power and the impulse to do readily that which benefits a rational nature so as to achieve true happiness.[82]

Which effects a union; "Love is a union. Conjugal love is the union of the man and the woman."[33] The union to which we refer here is not the union or the juridical bond *{matrimonium in facto esse}* which results from the consent mutually given and accepted by the interested parties, but the union which constitutes one of the advantages of matrimony, once it has been effected.[34] It is the union of which St. Thomas speaks when he says: "Love is nothing more than a transformation of affections into the thing loved. And because everything which is made a form of something becomes one with it, therefore, through love, the one loving becomes one with the beloved, in that he is made the form of the

" Ivo Zeiger, S.J., "Nova Definitio Matrimonii," p, 48*: 'Tntelligimus sensu pleniore amorem conjugalem virtutem, qua coniux sincere alteri adhaeret, reverentiam ei exhibens et fidem servans, eum fovet, adiuvat, ita ut in mutua caritate et patientia iuncti e*fi*orment principium novum, moraliter unum, cui tota vita coniugalis, officia gravissima procreationis atque educationis sobolis secure superstrui queant."

wDavis, Henry, S.J., *Moral and Pastoral Theology* (4th ed., London: Sheed & Ward, 1945), I, p. 253.

" Mersch, Emile, S.J., *Morality and the Mystical Body,* p, *216.*

[88] St. Thomas Aquinas, *op. cit.,* "coniunctio autem corporum et animorum ad matrimonium consequitur."

one loving."[35] Scheeben expresses this idea most clearly when he says:

> Love among creatures does not really contain in itself the good that pleases it in the beloved or the good that it would present to the beloved, any more than the cognition of creatures really contains its object or is identical' with it. We say indeed that lovers would like to give themselves, their very being, to each other in their love. But this mutual giving is a donation only according to affection, it is a mere affection without a real union, just as the representation of an object in us is no more than a thought.[35]

The union thus effected is not a physical union but a *moral* one.[8'] In it we see the joining of two complete human personalities in the manner explained. In each personality this love should imply by its very nature a combination of both appetites which go into the composition of the human being: "(we) see quite clearly that there are heavenly desires as well as earthly ones, that love has two mansions, one in the spirit and the other in the viscera, that the two mingle in most human acts. . ."[SB] The married person owes it to himself and to his partner to give himself completely, i.e., both his spiritual and physical nature will have their part. If he fails to do this, he allows to lie fallow one of those ingredients of his nature with which he has been endowed by God. His failure, then, is a failure to use the talents given him by God. But accepting the provision that man will act in accordance with his nature, he will give himself completely, i.e., his spiritual and physical (we specifically include in this instance

* St. Thomas Aquinas, HI Sent., d. 27, q. I, a. I : "unde amor nihil aliud est quam quaedam transformatio affectus in rem amatam. Et quia omne quod efficitur forma alicius efficitur unum cum illo, ideo per amorem, amans fit unum cum amato, quod est factum forma amantis." Cf. also : I-II, q. 25, a. 2, ad 2 ; q. 28, a. 1. corp, ad 2 ; Ford, *op. cit.,* p. 357.

•° Scheeben, Matthias J., *The Mysteries of Christianity,* Trans, by Cyril Vollert, SJ. (St. Louis: Herder, 1946), p. 67; cf. also p. 99.

K Ibid., p. 597.

•D'Arcy, *op. cit.,* p. 153.

sexual) natures will take their part in the degree of their importance in man's constitution.

It is not surprising that man's spiritual nature will assume the role of greatest importance when the appetites are brought into play. This befits man's dignity as a human personality, inasmuch as his spirituality constitutes his essential difference from the brute animal. Pope Pius XI indicated the importance of this appetite when he declared: "By matrimony, therefore, the souls of the contracting parties are joined and knit together prior to and more intimately than are their bodies. . ,"[38] Leclercq also voiced these sentiments when he said:

> But if physical love is one of the normal components of married love, it does not follow that it must be allowed to become the dominant one. . . . It (the Church) has never ceased to teach that the main thing in all love, its nobleness, its purity—even in the case of married love—is the union of souls, spiritual love. . .[40]

Mersch probably has the clearest statement on this point. He states "Human love is something other than a sentiment; it is essentially—though not exclusively—a procedure of the soul and a willed giving of oneself."[41] While the spiritual appetite plays the chief role, we cannot forget that the physical and sexual appetites will have their part in this love. Zeiger goes so far as to say that: "Conjugal love is essentially founded on the human sexual tendency,"[42] However, in making this assertion, he does not cease to give the spiritual appetite its position of superiority in this type of love. For concluding his explanation, he declares: "The sexual tendency, by which men are led to enter marriage, implies not only a union of bodies but especially a union of their souls."[43] The inclusion of the sexual appetite is no more than

[38] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 542 f.: "Coniugio igitur animi iunguntur et coalescunt, hique prius et arctius quam corpora. . ."

[39] Leclercq, Jacques, *Marriage and the Family,* p. 124.

[41] Mersch, *op. cit.,* p, 218.

[42] Zeiger, *op. cit.,* p. 42*.

[43] *Ibid.,* p. 44*.

right, for the human body is an essential part of thé human being. Conjugal love would risk being imperfect were it to lack this necessary bodily element. This is not to say that the inclusion of this element in actual use is absolutely necessary. We know that for the essence of marriage it is necessary only that the right to the conjugal act be given; the use or the exercise of this right is not necessary.[44][45] We may say the same of conjugal love. Ordinarily, however, this physical element will be present. For if the primary end of marriage is to be attained (and it is the purpose of the secondary end to help bring this about), the physical union of the husband and wife is necessary. This is an ordination of nature. The right to this act is the central part of the marriage contract, wherein each party receives and accepts the *jusjn.eorpus alterius.*

> The importance which the Church attaches to sexual relations in marriage—an importance evidenced by the fact that the impotency of either party constitutes grounds for a declaration of nullity—is one more proof of its realism. Marriage is a human institution. Man is both body and spirit, and the human race is divided into two sexes whose reason for existence is physical union with a view to continuing the species.[48]

If conjugal love, then, has a real relation to the primary end of marriage, it must be necessarily connected with man's sexual or physical tendencies. And it does have a real relation to the primary end. We have already seen that conjugal love is a part of the secondary end of mutual help. Bearing this in mind, we must correlate it with this recent statement of the Rota: "(Mutual help and community of life) are distinguished *by their internal relation to the primary end;* and by this end the conjugal union is distinguished from every other association of men."[46]*The only conclusion that we can draw from this comparison is that conjugal

[44] Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 734,

[45] Leclercq, *op. cit.,* p. 124.

[46] "The Sacred Roman Rota, *op. cit.,* 188 f.: "'Distinguuntur autem *interna sua relatione ad finem primarium,* quo fine coniunctio coniugalis a qualibet alia hominum associatione discernitur."

love itself is also distinguished by its internal relation to the primary end. Thus there is no reason to doubt its connection with the sexual sphere. Conjugal love, then, implies a love in which both of man's appetites (spiritual and physical) will have their part.

A union of husband and wife: it almost seems needless to discuss why conjugal love should be the union of two persons who are husband and wife and only of husband and wife. The very meaning of the word, the joining of two under the same yoke, indicates this. It was to this joining that St. Thomas referred when he said: "the joining of husband and wife by matrimony is the greatest of all joinings, since it is a joining of soul and body, wherefore it is called a conjugal union."[47] We find still graver reasons, from this when we inquire into the essence of marriage. It cannot be doubted that most theologians hold the conjugal bond, the *vinculum matrimonii,* to be the essence of marriage *in facto esse*. Thus no action can be properly called "conjugal" unless it has been performed by one under the subjection of that bond. Moreover, it is required that the action itself have some definite connection with that bond. Ford expressly declares:

> It (marriage) is the juridical bond (with its end and properties) created by the consent of the partners. That is the one thing that is found wherever marriage is found and without which marriage cannot exist. And all these acts of conjugal life and love by which the partners achieve community of life (two-in-oneship), and procreation, and the remedy for concupiscence, are conjugal only because they are performed by persons linked together by such a juridical bond.[48]

Applying this to conjugal love, we find one real reason why conjugal love differs from every other form of love, specifically from pre-marital love. Conjugal love by its nature involves two people under this juridical bond which is the essence of marriage; it is vitally concerned with those actions which have a proper relation

[47] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae,* III (Suppl.), q. 44, a. 2, ad 3. "coniunctio viri ad mulierem per matrimonium est maxima, cum sit et animarum et corporum. Et ideo coniugium nominatur."

[48] Ford, *op. cit.,* p. 366.

to or flow from this bond. It is properly then a love of husband and wife.

A union by which the spouses wish to give to each other the marital benefits·, we wish to restrict the goods which the spouses desire to give each other through conjugal love to those that spring from the hnnd Foro<î?Claies. "conjugal love must be distinguished from other love not only in the persons loving and loved, but also by the kind of good or benefit which through love they desire to give one another."[49] When we stated that conjugal love was a love of husband and wife, we also indicated that conjugal love should be concerned with those actions which have a relation to or flow from the marital bond. jrhis^ means that not all of jhe actions which the husband and wife perform are conjugalnor are all the benefits or they desire for one another conjugal *goods. Placed in* this category would be the fictions and benefits which have no_intrinsic relation to marriaggoFto the marital bontÇand hence mayTe prcrperlvnerformed nt HesireH pvpn_**hy nr fQ^singlc oorGong^n** view ofjhis^A'e might say the highest,temporal happiness of anothéi^without having conjugal Joye-forJaim. To be properly conjugal love it" is^iecessary that the good desired Jiave.a certain connection whlj **marriage h^nd-** or the ends that are essential to it/Vviiat-Tfien are these marital, or conjugal benefits? No one states precisely what they are. In enumerating them we believe that most authors would include the marriage act itself. Besides that we might list those mutual gifts or duties stated by the Rota as being under the classification "mutual help": e.g., "cohabitation, thejzommon table, the use of material goods, the government of the family, more personal aid in the various conditions of their life, aid in their mental and physical needs. . ?,st› Undoubtedly we could list many more acts of mutual help which could be classed

[49] *Ibid.,* p. 358.

[50] "'The Sacred Roman Rota, *op. cit.,* 187 f.: "Alius finis secundarius est 'mutuum adiutorium,' quod sat varias coniugum mutuas praestationes seu officia comprehendit, v.g., cohabitationem, communionem mensae, usum bonorum materialium, victus acquisitionem et administrationem, auxilium magis personale in variis vitae condicionibus, in exigentiis psychicis **et** somaticis. . ."

as conjugal benefits. It would not be to our purpose to mention all of them. But we would like to reduce them, as many as there are, to the *tria bona, i.e., bonum prolis, bonum fidei* and *bonum sacramenti,* as St. Augustine seems to do when he says: "In matrimony, however, let these nuptial blessings be the object^of. our love—offspring, fidelity, and the '.sacrament.'[51]~This may be the meaning *of* Ford when he declares: 1'hey can be nothing else than the acts of conjugal life ; that is, the marriage act and the acts of mutual help. These are the benefits that marriage is calculated to produce (the *bona producenda}* ; these are the ends for which marriage was instituted."[52] But whether it is or is not his meaning, we are of the hope that an analysis of these goods, i.e., the *tria bona,* will show that they implicitly or explicitly contain within their concepts these acts of mutual help or in other words the conjugal benefits. First, the *bonum prolis.* This good has a direct relation to the primary end of marriage, the procreation and education of children. Payen states : "It pertains principally to the primary end of matrimony. For it rests on the power and obligation of using matrimony so that children might be generated ; in addition it has a similar basis in the duty of educating children that have already been begotten."[53] It thus must include within its concept the marriage act itself. **Jt** also pertains to the secondary ends ; for the love betwccn**jhe** spouses is singularly nourished by the_righteous generation and education of children.[54] Finally, it serves a real need to the partners. The same act which serves as a means of procreation accomplishes the remedying of concupiscence and satisfies the craving for love. Secondly, the *bonum fidei.* This good also has a relation to the marital act, since it commands that

[51] St. Augustine, *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentiis,* I, 16, 19 (CSEL 42, p. 231): '"In nuptiis tamen bona nuptialia diligantur: proles, fides, sacramentum."

[52] "Ford, *op. cit.,* p. 358,

[53] "Payen, *op. cit.,* I, p. 81: "(Bonum prolis) refertur praecipue ad finem *primanum* matrimonii. Situm enim est in *potestate et obligatione* ita utendi matrimonio ut proles generari possit. Situm est pariter in officio prolem susceptam educandi."

[54] *Ibid.;* "At pertinet etiam ad fines *secundarios.* . . Recta enim prolis generatione et educatione *mutuus inter coniuges amor* singulariter fovetur. .

the *debituni* be rendered to one's spouse, and is not to be granted to a third party. It also pertains to the secondary ends of marriage. As Griese states: "Considered particularly in its negative aspect, conjugal fidelity is associated also with the secondary end of marriage which is known as mutual help and Avith the element of conjugal love."[55] Likewise in its positive aspect it is related to this end, inasmuch as it demands a mutual love of charity which is expressed in deeds of mutual help.[58] Any number of conjugal benefits would be indicated here, for included would be all those actions which contribute directly or indirectly to The allaying of suspicion and the increase ofTnutual faith. BeTtrrc continuing to the *bonum sacramenti,* let us noteTere~a most appropriate statement of Merkelbach, in which he sums up the relationship we were attempting to express between conjugal love and the first two goods of marriage: "To which two ends can be reduced conjugal love and the remedy of concupiscence, which implicitly tend towards the *bonum prolis* and the *bonum fidei."*[61] Finally, the *bonum sacramenti.* This concerns itself with both the primary and secondary ends of marriage. Speaking of this good in its relation to matrimony as an office of nature, St. Thomas says: "the sacrament here does not mean matrimony itself, but its indissolubility, which^is a sign.of the same thing as matrimony is."[58] In this signification the good implies the duty of the spouses to live together in an unbroken community of life. Since it is relative to the primary end which is concerned strictly with the good of offspring, we can see its effects when we consider the evils of that to which it is directly opposed, i.e., divorce. If divorce were allowed, the interests of the child would be wholly disregarded.

[55] Griese, N. Orville, *The Marriage Contract and the Procreation of Offspring* (C.U.A. Canon Law Studies, No. 226, Washington: Catholic University Press, 1946), p. 12, note 30.

[58] A. Vermeersch, S.J., "Encyc. 'Casti Conubii,' Annotationes," *Periodica,* 20 (1931), p. 47: "In primis et tamquam principatum nobilitatis tenens, (fides coniugalis) postulat veram, mutuam dilectionem caritatis . . . operosam, idque non tantum per mutuum auxilium. .

[61] Merkelbach, III, p. 942.

[58] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae,* III (Suppi.), q. 49, a. 2, ad 7. "Sacramentum non dicitur hic ipsum matrimonium, sed inseparabilitas eius, quae eiusdem est rei signum cuius est matrimonium."

That which would bring a solution of the problems of the parents would at the same time deprive the child of that which is its strict due. It has a strict right, generally speaking, to the care of both parents: the^Itm^gHone" indicts a"severe injury" Inasmuch as it puts-ajialter on the child's tuture development·^ With regard to the secondary ends of THiirnage, it has an even more cardinal concern. As Griese asserts: "Likewise the boon of sacramental stability (indi^nlnbilitv)· if considered "as a contributing factor to security in maritalme7 is associated particularly with the secondary end of marriage which is known as mutual help. . ."[80] Without this good it would be relatively impossible to attain these ends. However, when the spouses live together in harmony with an assurance of permanency, they are able to realize a great number of acts of mutual help. We would certainly state that this good would include within its scope those acts of mutual help specifically mentioned by the Rota.[81] It thus seems that the *tria bona* would explicitly or· implicitly include all the acts of mutual help or all the marital benefits that the spouses desire for one another. If this statement is true, it is correct to state that the marital benefits which the spouses wish to give one another—that is to say, the_-ppqUPT~"tilrre6ts_,of conjugal Jove—are nothing more than the three goods of marriage. """'"x-------- ---

ARTICLE II. CONJUGAL LOVE—ITS SPECIFIC DIFFERENCE

We hope that the explanation we have-just completed of our definition contains within itself the reasons that will justify the use of that definition. We recognize that there are a number of implications which could be given more adequate treatment, but since it is impossible *to* develop all of these, we will turn to one which deserves special consideration. That is the specific difference of conjugal love. What special quality does it contain or what relation does it have 'that specifically distinguishes it from other fornis or types oTThye.'

* Joyce, Geo. H., S.J., *Christian Marriage* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1933), pp. 21-22.

80 Griese, *op. cit.,* p. 12.

81 *Supra,* p. 42.

In searching for the specific difference oi-XQnjugal love, it is evident that we begin that search by an analysis of the status of conjugal love in marriage. It belongs Jxujj^rriage j^s part of its secondary end of mutual help.[62] This sentence has two important implications. First? in that it does belong to marriage, we find the remote cause of its difference from other types of love. To be eligible to perforin such an act of love or to become its object, it is necessary that one be in the mjjxieH^sÎàte. It is essential to the notion of conjugal love'that those who are to be considered its principles—in whom lie the potencies to perform acts of conjugal love—and those who are its objects must be bound together as husband and wife by the bond of marriage.[63] The second implication of this sentence is that, as conjugal love is part of the secondary end of mutual help, so herein lies the proximate reason for its specific difference. In its recent statement on the ends of marriage the Rota declared that mutual help and the life-partnersh'ip between tweb persons' of ditterent sexes could exist even outside of marriage. It therefore stated:

> Mutual help and community of life inasmuch as they are called and are *proper to matrimony* and to its *secondary end,* must be considered according to a certain special propriety, by which they are distinguished from any other community of life or mutual help. In truth they are distinguished *by their internal relation^to the primary end,* by which end the conjugal union is distingtiished fromall other associations of men7^ "

Cappello arrives at the same conclusion, although he is considering not one of the ends, but the association of marriage itself and its

Supra, p. 32.

[63] *Supra,* p. 41.

[04] The Sacred Roman Rota, *op. cit.,* 188 f.: "Ideo mutuum adiutorium vitaeque communio, inquantum dicuntur et sunt *matrimonii propria* eiusque *secundarius finis operis,* considerari debent secundum proprietatem quandam specialem, qua distinguuntur a qualibet alia communione vitae, cum mutua adiutorio coniuncta. Distinguuntur autem *interna sua relatione ad finem primarium,* quo fine coniunctio coniugalis a qualibet alia hominum associatione discernitur."

specific difference from all similar contracts. He states: "In the notion of matrimony those elements must be considered which are so proper and exclusive of it that they *specifically* distinguish it from all other similar association and contracts. That *specific* element—altogether proper and, exclusive ot matrimony—is the lawful procreation and education of offspring."[65] In order to confirm this statement of Cappello we return once again to the declaration of the Rota. In this instance, unlike the previous, it speaks of matrimony as a whole. The conclusion is the same however. "It is necessary, therefore, that there be a determined order amongst the ends of matrimony, according to which the other ends *(fines operis)* are subordinate to the principal end, *which determines the specific nature of matrimony."*[66] With the weight of such authority, we have no hesitation in stating that the primary end of marriage is that which distinguishes it from any other association of men. Similarly, we can state that the secondary end of marriage, mutual help, is distinguished by its internal relation to this same primary end. Applying these statements to the notion of conjugal love, we cannot but conclude that this love, as a part of mutual help, will take upon itself the same specifying character. The specific difference of conjugal love then lies in its internal relation to the primary end of matrimony.

The ultimate basis for this conclusion must lie in the very nature of marriage.[67] Previously we have discussed pre-marital love. We have learned its nature and characteristics. We have seen that it consists in a union of the souls of the two parties, which is so intense and so exclusive that we can see no other reason for it except that it is destined to lead them to marriage.[68] But we do

[65] Cappello, *op. cit.,* p. 4 : "In notione matrimonii ea elementa spectanda sunt, quae sunt ita ipsius propria et exclusiva, ut illud *specifice* distinguant a ceteris quibuscumque negotiis et contractibus. Elementum autem *specificum*—omnino proprium et exclusivum matrimonii—est legitima sobolis procreatio et educatio."

[66] "The Sacred Roman Rota, *op. cit.,* 185 f.: "Necesse igitur est ut inter matrimonii fines determinatus sit ordo, secundum quem fini principali, qui naturam specificam matrimonii determinat, alii fines operis subordinentur." (Italics mine.)

[67] *Ibid.,* 188 f.

[68] *Supra,* p. 12.

not believe that it will continue unchanged once the marriage takes place. The nature of marriage—the rights and duties it confers—will have their effect upon it. They will change it and make it different. That right most fundamental to the nature of marriage and from which these other rights have their source is that which is the center of the marriage contract. **Jt** is stated thus in the Code of Canon Law: Yhe matrimonial consent is an act of the will by which each party gives and accepts the perpetual^ and exclusive right to the body for the performance of actions that of their nature pertain to the procreation of children."[80] From this Lavaud concludes: "Therefore, whatever may be the place and importance of other aspects in the life of married couples it is the sexual act that specifies conjugal society and life in that which is jrreducibly proper and peculiar to it. The right to this act is the precise object of matrimonial consent."[70] We do not believe that Lavaud is here giving too much stress to the physical aspect of conjugal love. He is merely stating that the sexual act is~tnat which specifies marriage, and allows for other thing·; which may have more importance. Zeiger speaking of matrimonial consent states that it differs from other contracts in its object: "Matrimonial consent differs from other contracts chiefly in its object. The man and woman deliberately and freely give themselves to one another for the greatest intimacy of their whole life, both bodily and interior, and this for always and exclusively."[71] If we put aside for a moment the reference to the *matrimonium in fieri,* and instead apply it to *matrimonium in facto esse, we* have a precise and well-balanced statement or summation of our whole viewpoint on conjugal love. It is a union of souls—as such it bears a

w *Codex luris Canonici,* Canon 1081, 2: "Consensus matrimonialis est actus voluntatis quo utraque pars tradit et acceptat ius in corpus, perpetuum et exclusivum, in ordine ad actus per se aptos ad prolis generationem."

70 B. Lavaud, O.P., "The Interpretation of the Conjugal Act and the Theology of Marriage," *The Thotnist,* 1 (1939), p. 360; cf. also: Karl Adam, "Sanctification of Marriage," *Orate Fraires,* 9 (1935), p. 172.

71 Zeiger, *op. cit.,* p. 47*: "Nam consensus matrimonialis ab aliis contractibus maxime differt obiecto. Vir et femina deliberate et libere se ipsos sibi invicem tradunt, ad totius vitae maximam întimitatem, tam corporalem quam interiorem, et hoc pro semper, et exclusive."

resemblance to pre-marîtal love—that is specified by that which is the object of the matrimonial contract, the *jus tn corpus,* for the performance of actions that by their nature are ordained to the procreation of children. Once the matrimonial consent is given and the bond comes into existence, pre-marital love *ipso facto* ceases to exist. That which makes marriage marriage, i.e·, the sexual relationship, changes it unalterably.

In 'the light of the foregoing one can surmise why we do not agree with the statement of Von Hildebrand when he declares that "the specificounlity not only of love as such, hut of wedded love in pa7ticular7 is independent of the physical aspect of sex."[72] Nor do tve"agree with Ins following statement:

> The bond between wedded love and physical sex can, of course, be *also* regarded as a means to procreation. But from this point of view it is impossible to discover the significance of sex for man *in quantum homo,* or give an account of what constitutes the special intrinsic meaning of the bond. This, on the contrary, must be sought in the significance of sex as expression and fulfillment.[73]

We wonder how he would reconcile these statements with the recent declaration of the Nota when it states that the primary end of marriage is that which determines its specific nature, and that mutual help in marriage is distinguished by its internal relation to that same primary end. We do not believe that we have overemphasized the role of the physical in conjugal love, nor again have we underestimated the part that man's spiritual nature plays in it. We have stated that the spiritual plays the more vital part, but not the whole part. The physical too must be considered. It is not to be relegated merely to a point where it is to be an expression of a higKer **form** of love, buFit is to be looked upon also as a means to the fulfillment of the primary end of matrimony. Moreover, it must be remembered that man exercises his sex instincts at the direction of his will. There is thus a direct connection between man's rational nature and his physical nature. This must

[73] Von Hildebrand, *op. cit.,* p. 18; *supra,* p. 36.
[n] *Ibid.,* p. 21.

be taken into consideration in any inquiry into the nature of conjugal love.

ARTICLE in. CONJUGAL LOVE----ITS BROADER ASPECTS

Returning to our definition, we must state that we have been discussing conjugal love in its subjective sense, i.e., as it exists in the minds of the spouses. This is essentially what conjugal love is, and when one speaks of it, ordinarily he is speaking of it in this sense. We can, however, speak of it in a wide sense. In this improper sense we can speak of the contractual consent, the rendering of the *debitum ex justitia* and marriage for one's own material enrichment, as manifestations of conjugal love.

"Conjugal love we understand in an imperfect sense as the matrimonial consent by which the spouses mutually grant to each other the right, perpetual and exclusive to the acts of conjugal life, considered in all its fulness."[74] Here Zeiger states that the matrimonial consent is an act of conjugal love, but this is an imperfect use of the term. "Such a surrender (of the conjugal rights), if it is fully considered *in se,* must suppose at least some imperfect, inchoate love ; the free consent to such a surrender is not only an external expression of that internal love, but it is the love itself."[75] Ford admits such a meaning of conjugal love.

> The essential marriage bond is a benefit undoubtedly, and a conjugal benefit. The elements that make it up are the *bona constituentia* of marriage. But as a good thing lovingly given it pertains to the marriage *in fieri.* When the partners gave their consent to the bond, that indeed was

[74] Zeiger, *op. cit.,* p. 460 : "Amorem coniugalem *intelligimus* in sensu imperfecto ipsum consensum matrimonialem, quo coniuges sibi mutuo ius tradunt perpetuum et exclusivum ad actus et vitam coniugalem in tota sua amplitudine sumptam"; cf. also: Vermeersch, *Theologiae Moralis,* IV, p. 31; "J. A. McHugh, O.P., "The Meaning of Marriage," HPR, 41 (1941), p. 973.

[75] Zeiger, *op. cit.,* p. 457 "Talis traditio, si in se plene consideratur, non potest non supponere amorem saltem aliqualem, inchoatum, imperfectum; consensus vero liber in istam traditionem expressio est externa amoris istius interni, est ipse amor."

[76] Ford, *op. cit.,* p. 358.

Ford in admitting that the consent pertains to the *matrimonium in fieri* also gives us the reason why we consider such a consent an act of conjugal love only in an imperfect sense. Properly speaking conjugal love pertains to the *matrimonium in facto esse.* To use the term in any other context then is to use it in an imperfect sense. In proof of this we adduce the following facts. First, when we speak of matrimony, we generally refer to it as a union which is already in existence. For example, this is the manner in which St. Thomas speaks of it. "Matrimony is not the consent itself, but the union of persons directed to one purpose . . . and this union is the effect of the consent."[77] This is matrimony in its proper sense. Secondly, viewing the relationship of conjugal love to matrimony, we can come to no other conclusion than that it belongs to *matrimonium in facto esse.* Previously we have seen that conjugal love is distinguished from other types of love by its internal relation to the primary end of matrimony.[78] This primary end is achieved in cooperation with nature through the performance of the conjugal act. The right to this act, however, the *jus in corpus,* since it is the object of the matrimonial contract, is properly a part of *matrimonium in facto esse.* If we consider Payen's definition, we will see that this is true. "It is the exclusive and perpetual union for generating offspring; it is the conjugal bond; considered in its source, the marital union, it is the exclusive and perpetual right to the conjugal acts. . ."[79] We can therefore conclude that the source of the relationship of conjugal love to matrimony is the *matrimonium in facto esse.* If this is true, any use of the term "conjugal love" outside of this context, is an improper or imperfect use of that term. This means that when the contractual consent is spoken of as conjugal love, it is in an imperfect sense that it is meant.

77St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae,* III (Suppl.), q. 45, a. 1, ad 2: "Matrimonium non est ipse consensus, sed quaedam unio ordinatorum ad unum . . . quam consensus facit."

[78] *Supra,* p. 47.

[79] Payen, *op, cit.,* I, p. 60: "Sed est exclusiva et perpetua, ad prolem generandam, conjunctio; vinculum conjugale; jus, exclusivum et perpetuum, ad actus conjugales, in sua radice, quae est conjunctio maritalis, consideratum.

In connection with the contractual consent as a form of conjugal love, Zeiger cites the case of a young man who marries an elderly woman with the avowed and hopeful intention of thereby gaining her wealth.[80] Now, although this intention is uppermost in his mind, he, nevertheless, wishes to accept all the duties and obligations that accompany the marital state. The marriage, therefore, is valid, and the consent expressed is a true matrimonial consent. In thus granting the conjugal rights, we may say that no matter how reluctantly he may have done so he shows a certain conjugal love. "As long as he has truly and not fictitiously consented, there is present that love, widely imperfect even, but still a true union of souls."[81]

That it pertains to conjugal love to grant the *debitum* when it is demanded *ex justitia* seems a strange assertion. But a strong indication that one may attach such a signification to this act may be derived from the words of the Holy Father: "By this same love it is necessary that all the other rights and duties of the marriage state be regulated as the words of the Apostle: 'Let the husband render the debt to the wife, and the wife also in like manner to the husband,' express not only a law of justice but of charity."[82] Although primarily the virtue of justice is involved here, we may say that by the same act by which one renders the *debitum ex justitia* one may be expressing at least an incipient form of conjugal love. It is much the same idea as that expressed in the contractual consent. Vermeersch states: "In the surrender (of the conjugal rights) there is actuated that giving of oneself by which mutual love is shown."[83] This concept has as its basis the notion that love is based on justice. It is so expressed by Farrell;

> When the Church insists that the marriage contract is a matter of strict justice, she is not replacing love by a

[80] Zeiger, *op. cit.,* p. 47

[81] *Ibid.,* "Sed dummodo vere et non ficte consentit, adest ille amor valde imperfectus quidem, sed vera animorum unio."

[82] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 549 f.; "cum hoc eadem caritate reliqua coniugii tam iura quam officia componantur necesse est; ita ut non solum iustitiae lex, sed etiam caritatis norma sit illud Apostoli: 'Uxori vir debitum reddat; similiter autem et uxor viro (1 Cor. 7:3).'" (PPt, p. 8.)

[83] Vermeersch, *Theologiae Moralis,* IV, p. 31: "In ista traditione actuatur donatio sui quo fert mutuus amor."

> heartless commercialism; she is merely insisting on a guarantee of the absolute «ninimum necessary for love. Surely the man who refuses the demands of justice to another cannot pretend to be wishing this other good.[84]

Continuing his explanation he says: "Christ Himself made justice the minimum of love when He said: 'If you love me, keep my commandments/ for the commandments are the minimum of love for God and are all commands of justice."[85] Similarly one cannot truly say that he has fulfilled the commandment to love his neighbor, until his actions have reached the degree or standard by which they can be considered as acts of love. It is in view of the above explanation that we speak of the *debitum*. Although one is bound to render it in justice, still in granting that right there is a certain conjugal love expressed.

To complete our treatment of the definitions of conjugal love, we now consider conjugal love in its fullest sense, i.e., as supernaturally elevated. It is our intention here to cite Zeiger's definition, and leave further consideration of this type of love to our chapter on "mutual sanctification." By citing the definition at this time, our picture of conjugal love, at least in so far as definitions are concerned, will be complete. It follows:

> Supernaturally elevated, conjugal love is that love in which the spouses, united by the Sacrament and aided by sacramental grace, by common effort and zeal are informed, both themselves and their children, with heavenly virtues, tend to a supernatural end, and so in a more perfect manner than is otherwise possible, represent that most chaste and most holy love, with which Christ embraces the Church.[86]

[83] Farrell, Walter, O.P., *A Companion to the Summa,* III, p. 439.

[84] *Ibid.,* IV, p. 398.

[85] Zeiger, *op. cit.,* p. 48 "Cui in connubio christiano accedere debet amor sensu plenissimo sumptus, sci., supernaturaliter elevatus, quo coniuges Sacramento coniuncti, gratia sacramentali adiuti, conatu communi atque studio et ipsi et filii virtutibus coelestibus informentur, tendant ad finem supernaturalem, et sic perfectiori quo fien potest modo repraesentent amorem illum castissimum atque sanctissimum, quo Christus Ecclesiam amplectitur."

ARTICLE IV. THE QUALITIES OF CONJUGAL LOVE

Previously we have spoken of those parts of man's nature which must be brought into play in order to have a true conjugal love, i.e., man's rational, sensitive and sexual tendencies. Now we must consider the quality of the love itself. Is it a love of concupiscence, or does it partake of a higher classification? What special properties does it show? What may we include as characteristics of this type of love? These and other questions we will attempt to answer in this article.

At the very least we will say that conjugal love includes the love of concupiscence, i.e,, the love whereby one loves someone because of the good he himself will attain through his act of love.[87] The reason for this is quite evident since it must be said that all love, at least insofar as human beings are concerned, has a motive of selfishness in it. This selfishness, however, can be reduced to its proper minimum in conjugal love, if we say that it should not be considered as the chief constituent of conjugal love, but only the source or beginning of a love that will finally attain to a love of true friendship. In a certain manner, Gilson indicates this when he says:

> Man born of carnal desire, needs to live, and cannot live without setting up himself as the object of his own desire, and since he could not desire himself without desiring all he needs as well, we must say that he loves himself in the first place, and then all the rest for pure self-love.[88]

Probably this is what Mersch had in mind when he said: "It (love) leads the man and woman, by a movement sensible and exacting, from *preoccupations egoistic enough in the beginning,* to a splendid life of devotion and forgetfulness of self."[89] True conjugal love would thus start from self-love, and building upon that, would advance to a love of true friendship, which we consider to be the true and proper type of conjugal love.

Supra, p. 8.

[88] Gilson, Etienne, *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy,* p. 270.

[89] Mersch, *op. cit.,* p. 212. (Italics mine.)

In line with our considerations above, we would also include the love of benevolence as pffrt of conjugal love. One spouse may love the other for the good which he sees in him or her. He may be attracted purely by the good he finds in the other, and hence no trace of selfishness may be found in his love. Farrell expresses this idea very clearly when he says : "Unselfish love means no more than the constant, effective desire to do good to another. Briefly, it means that we have identified ourselves with another; his will is our will so that his good is our good, his happiness our happiness."[00] These facts are quite evident. Properly speaking, however, conjugal love is a mutual benevolent love, a love of true friendship wherein the spouses return the love which they show for each other. St. Thomas treating of this says: "Between the husband and wife there is seen in existence the greatest friendship ; for they are united not only in the act of carnal intercourse, which makes for a certain pleasant friendship even amongst beasts, but also for the community of their whole domestic life."[01] The very notion of friendship requires that there be a return of love. Hence between the spouses where the greatest friendship exists, each should return the love of the other. St. Thomas warns: "Although the force of the lover's act may reach the one who does not love, yet there can be no union between them, unless there be a mutual love. And therefore the Philosopher says for friendship, which consists in a certain union, there is required a return of love."[02] In insisting upon this Mersch states: "Love, we repeat, is a union. It is impossible without a reciprocal donation of self, by which each partner renounces his life as an isolated individual, in order to become one with the other."[03] We have already seen how conjugal

[00] Farrell, *op. cit.,* III, p. 61.

[01] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Contra Gentiles,* Liber III, C. 123 : "Inter virum autem et uxorem maxima amicitia esse videtur. Adunantur enim non solum in actu carnalis copulae, quae etiam inter bestias quamdam suavem amicitiam facit, sed ad totius domesticae conversationis consortium. . ."

[02] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae,* III (Suppi.), q. 47, a. 4, ad 1 : "Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod quamvis actus amantis possit transire in non amantem, tamen unio inter eos non potest esse, nisi sit mutua amatio. Et ideo dicit Philosophus quod ad amicitiam, quae in quadam unione consistit, requiritur redamatio."

[03] Mersch, *op. cit.,* p. 217.

love results in the union of husband and wife. If this union is to be secured, then the love out of which conjugal love will be constituted will lead to this union. Since only the love of friendship meets this demand, conjugal love will consist primarily in this. As such, the *reciprocal* love of the spouses will be required. To sum up, that love which best meets the requirements of conjugal love, the one which will result in the union of souls demanded by this love, is a mutual benevolent love, a love of true friendship.[84]

From love conceived in this light we are led to make several important deductions. First, this type of love must exclude selfishness. Farrell says: "Friendship is a mutual benevolent love on a common ground, and has as its normal rule, unselfishness; or, in more simple terms, generosity."[85] Bonnar speaks in a very practical manner: "Selfishness is a moral fault, though not (when it stands alone) a grievously sinful one; but a married life which, even by mutual consent, abstains from full sexual life *solely from selfish motives,* will generally be guilty of other moral faults also, often grievous ones."[00] Bonnar speaks here of a particular phase of married life. If selfishness were to dominate the lives of the married couple, we could imagine how serious its effects would be. To combat selfishness in married life, Gerald Vann points out that the virtue of temperance is necessary for the spouses.

> It is temperateness which makes us reverent. . . If you lack temperateness you lack reverence, and therefore you cannot love. . . .You cannot love, you are restricted to a partial, because *selfish and sensual, pleasure;* whereas love is a total enhancement of being, a glorifying of the whole body-spirit, because it is essentially a vital oneness with what is good and lovely.[07]

Conjugal love thus must tend towards unselfishness; it will attain this end more easily if it is imbued with the virtue of temperateness.

[84] Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 799.

[85] Farrell, *op. cit.,* III, p. 84.

[00] Bonnar, A., O.F.M., *The Catholic Doctor* (2nd ed., New York; P. J. Kenedy, 1939), p. 68.

[07] Vann, Gerald, O.P., *The Divine Pity* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1946), p. 166. (Italics mine.)

More important thapjthe first deduction is the one that follows: true conjugal friendship implies that conjugal love will be endowed with the notes of permanency and exclusiveness. It seems to us that this notion flows from or is connected with the properties of marriage. We have already seen that conjugal love has an intrinsic relation to the fundamental right given in marriage, and that from this right it takes its specific difference. In much the same manner this love will take upon itself the properties of marriage, its unity and indissolubility. In terms that pertain to love we say that this love takes upon itself the exclusiveness and permanency of marriage.

That conjugal love should be permanent is indicated from many sources. Because of its place in marriage, conjugal love takes upon itself the permanency of marriage. It is meant to be permanent. Pre-marital love, on the other hand, is fleeting and transient. Pre-marital love is only properly fulfilled by conjugal love, and therefore is transient, since its object when possessed does away with it. Even more, it does not have the juridical bond of marriage to strengthen and consolidate it.[08] Love in marriage differs precisely because it is fortified by the permanency of this bond. Our late Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, alluded to this fact when stating the benefits which flow from the indissolubility of matrimony. "First of all, both husband and wife possess a positive guarantee of the endurance of this stability which that generous yielding of their persons and the intimate fellowship of their hearts by their nature strongly require, since true love never falls away."[09] A number of authors support this view. In answering the question, "How do you prove the natural law of perpetuity?" Vermeersch states:

> We prove it by the natural aspiration of the sentiment of love which desires to last forever; by the irrevocable character of mutual self-surrender, which rakes away from the woman her integrity; by the duty of education, which by

* *Supra,* p. 19.

*Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 553 f.: "Et primum quidem coniuges in hac firmitate certum habent perennitatis signaculum, quod generosa propriae personae traditio et intima suorum animorum consociatio suapte natura tantopere exigit, cum vera caritas finem nesciat."

> its nature requires years, and which goes on indefinitely, being renewed at every birth; finally by the duties of mutual help and mutual upbuilding which are implied in marriage and which do not cease until death.[100]

Again in his *Theologia Moralis,* he declares: "Nor is the perpetual and indissoluble durability of matrimony well explained without the necessity of human offspring, although love itself tends toward a perpetual and complete giving or communication of self."[101] Merkelbach's thoughts follow much the same pattern: "But love tends to perpetuity, since the total giving of self is irrevocable, and if otherwise, it would be unfair since it takes away the integrity of the woman."[102] Hanley is of the same opinion: "of itself, moreover, conjugal love tends to be permanent. . ."[103] Statements of others though not specifically applicable to this point bear out this fact. E.g., Gilson: "human love, in spite of all its ignorance, blindness and even downright error, is never anything but a finite participation in God's own love for Himself."[104] This being true, we must conclude that human love will partake in some measure of the permanency of God's own eternal love. As expressed by Farrell: "Like all love, this love was made to last forever; an element of temporality, of caution, some means of escape is a frank statement of the absence of love."[105] It thus seems, from the statements we have quoted above, that we are able to infer that conjugal love by its nature tends to be a permanent love. This is not to state, nor do we mean to imply, that conjugal love cannot

[100] Vermeersch, *What Is Marriage?* p. 11.

[101] Vermeersch, *Theologiae Moralis,* IV, p. 31: "Nec perpetua et indissolubilis firmitas matrimonii bene explicaretur sine illa humanae prolis necessitate, quamquam ipse amor in perpetuam et completam sui donationem seu communicationem propendet."

[102] Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 806: "atque amor tendit ad perpetuitatem, cum donatio totalis sit irrevocabilis, et si secus, esset inaequalis, cum integritatem mulieris auferat."

[103] Hanley, Thomas R., O.S.B., "'Natural Law on Marriage," p. 300; cf. also: Mersch, *op. cit.,* p. 217.

[104] Gilson, *op. cit.,* p. 274.

[105] Farrell, *op. cit.,* III, p. 76.

perish. At a matter of fact it often does, as we may infer from the divorces that have resumed because of its death.[108]

We wish to add here that the chief argument for the permanence of conjugal love is drawn from the primary end of marriage. The primary end demands that the marriage be permanent; otherwise its attainment becomes impossible. Merkelbach states :

> (Dissolubility) destroys conjugal society and renders attainment of the primary end impossible, namely the propagation and due education of the children to a suitable age ; for to obtain that end requires a period of long duration and the constant care of both spouses. This would be rendered impossible if the separation of the spouses could take place at their desire and at any moment.[107]

Conjugal love, inasmuch as it is ordained to the attainment of the primary end, will take upon itself the permanency required to bring about the attainment of that end. The practical manner in which conjugal love works to do this bears out our assertion. By its very nature it tends towards the union of the spouses. It keeps the spouses united and together in order that generation of the children might take place; it actually inclines the spouses toward the performance of the conjugal act, through which children are begotten. And finally, after the children have been born, it maintains the unity of the spouses so that these same children might be properly reared and educated. Truly, it is designed to be permanent.

In the same manner in which we stated that conjugal love demands permanence, we also contend it is endowed with the quality of exclusiveness. In the words of Merkelbach : "Conjugal

[108] We do not wish to state here that every divorce takes place because of the death of conjugal love. In many divorces conjugal love never existed in the first place.

[107] Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 805: "(Dissolubilitas) Destruit enim ipsam societatem coniugalem, et reddit impossibilem finem eius principalem: propagationem et debitam educationem prolis usque ad perfectam aetatem ; ad ill im finem requiritur diuturnum tempus et concors cura utriusque coniugis, et ideo ipse redderetur impossibilis, si pro libitu et omni momento separatio coniugum fieri posset."

love consists in the deepest friendship. But an intimate and perfect friendship bespeaks an exclusive love."[108] Supporting this view is Vermeersch:

> The sentiment of love, quite a different thing from that of quiet friendship, is jealous and exclusive. "Conjugal love," says Abbè Dermine, "must be exclusive under the pain of dissolving itself. Conjugal love shared with another excites jealousy and divides the heart. . . ." Besides how could the mutual total self-surrender which the conjugal union implies be realized between more than two people?[109]

Joyce in confirming these statements adds:

> There is a deep-rooted desire to possess'the heart of the person loved, not merely the body. It is a consequence of this that human love is intensely exclusive, that it can tolerate no sharing of the affections. And it is noteworthy that this jealousy of all intrusion is most marked in woman, in whom the instinctive side of affection is most strong.[110]

Lavaud's remarks follow much the same vein: "but the giving of self that is consummated in the union of bodies is not human and complete unless it is reserved exclusively to only one partner. A man cannot give himself wholly—mind, soul and body, to several women, nor can a woman give herself in like manner to several men."[111] To further strengthen their position the authors speak of the harmful effects of a divided love. Mersch begins, saying: "The fact is that the love of which we are speaking cannot, like charity, multiply its objects without dividing and lacerating itself. Because it is material, it must be limited, under pain of mutilation."[112]

[109] *Ibid.,* III, p. 799: "Amor conjugalis est maximae amicitiae. Sed amicitia intima et perfecta intendit amorem exclusivum."

[100] Vermeersch, *ÏVhat Is Marriage?* p. 10; Abbè Dermine, *Les Lois du Mariage Chretien,* p. 103.

[110] Joyce, *op. cit.,* p. 18.

[U1] Lavaud, *op. cit.,* p. 365; cf. also: Bonnar, *op. cit.,* p. 47.

[113] Mersch, *op. cit,,* p. 18.

Referring back to Joyce who this time directs his remarks particularly to the harmful effects of polygamy, we see that:

> Polygamy is gravely detrimental to the reciprocal attachment which should be found in marriage. The wife will assuredly not give her whole heart to a husband who offers her but a share in his divided affections. Physical union there may be; but the moral union can never be realized.[113]

In much the same way Poland states:

> Nature has ordained that there be love between two, and the man who gives his love to one woman must abide by it. Nature has ordained a single intense love, to the end of the formation of a stable society. . . Plurality of wives dividés the love, destroys the love.[114][115]

St. Thomas argues that since friendship consists in a certain equality, for a man to have many wives would be to reduce this friendship, at least on the part, of the wife, to a state of servility.[115] From every side then, on the part of the love itself which tends to be exclusive, and from the evil effects which a divided love would have on the parties concerned, conjugal love tends to be exclusive—it is directed towards one individual and one only. Thus from conjugal love that is first of all a love of true friendship, we have learned two important facts that are to have a profound effect on the lives of all married people. Conjugal love is at once both permanent and exclusive; hence it will exert itself mightily in preserving the stability of the marriage bond.

As a corollary, we note that it is within God's power to dispense from these qualities of permanency and exclusiveness. Merkelbach testifies to this fact when he says that although "Marriage cannot be dissolved by any earthly power, yet it can be dissolved by divine power, because any legislator *de se* can dissolve

[113] Joyce, *op cit.,* p. 19.

[114] William Poland, S.J., "The Natural Law in Marriage," TER, 22 (1900), p. 347.

[115] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Contra Gentiles, Liber* III, C. 124; *Summa Theologiae,* III (Suppl.), q. 65, a. 1.

a law which he has proposed by his own authority."[118] As a matter of fact it has happened in the past, and happens even now through the power communicated to the Church (as regards permanence) that God has actually dispensed from these qualities in some cases. For example, Christ witnesses the fact that divorce was permitted the Jews: "Moses, by reason of the hardness of your heart, permitted you to put away your wives. . ."[117] Polygamy was likewise permitted this people. In evidence of this we have the case of Abraham. It is noted of Abraham's wife that: "She took Agar the Egyptian her handmaid, and gave her to her husband to wife."[118] Finally, we have the case of the Pauline Privilege. God, working through the Church, grants it power to break a non-sacramental union under certain conditions which He has stipulated.[119]

In so far as the intensity of the love is concerned, it will be found that the higher the object of love the more ennobling it will be. This is in accord with the principle advanced by St. Thomas Aquinas that: "Love of the good *that is truly a good* for the being that loves, tends to perfect that being and bring it to a better condition. It is for this reason that man is in the highest measure perfected and elevated by the love of God."[120] The reason for this lies in the fact that the will, the faculty from which love proceeds, is determined by its object, as St. Thomas says.[121]*Farrell comments upon this in this way:

> The will . . . does not take things into itself; it goes out to things. We become what we desire. If that be infinitely

[119] Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 811: "Matrimonium quod nulla potestate terrestri dissolvi valet, solvi tamen potest potestate divina, quia unusquisque legislator de se solvere potest legem quam propria tulit auctoritate. . ."

[117] Mt. 19:8.

[118] Gen. 16:3.

[1101] Cor. 7:12.

[120] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae,* I-II, q. 28, a. 5, corp.: "Amor ergo boni convenientis est perfectivus et melîorativus amantis. . . Unde maxime homo perficitur et melioratur per amorem Dei . . cf. Leen, Edward, C.S.Sp., *The Holy Ghost and His Work in Souls* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1939), pp. 44-48.

[121] *Ibid.,* I, q. 16, a. 1, corp.: "Sicut autem bonum est in re, in quantum habet ordinem ad appetitum, et propter hoc ratio bonitatis derivatur a re appetibili in appetitum, secundum quod appetitus dicitur bonus, prout est boni. . ."

> above us, we^are lifted out of ourselves to that superior height; if it be beneath us, we are dragged down to the level of what we crave. If we place our goal in God, we soar to divine heights; if we revel in the pleasures of the animals, we are dragged down to the mire of animal existence.122

The lesson or moral that lies behind these statements is quite evident. It is incumbent upon each of the spouses to make himself a worthy object of love. The more worthy he is, the more will he ennoble his partner, of whose love he is the object. Each spouse necessarily affects the nature of the love of his partner. The quality of the love of each depends to a great extent on the other. Therefore, upon each rests the responsibility of making himself a worthy object of love. It is something they cannot escape. And the situation becomes more critical in the realization that any event, inasmuch as it affects one or the other for good or for evil, cannot but have a similar effect for good or evil upon the remaining spouse.

Our final consideration in this article is the question whether a man's love for his father and mother should take precedence over his love for his wife. St. Thomas answers this question by saying that in view of the good which is the object of love, the parents are to be loved more than the wife. However, in reference to relationship, the wife is to be loved more. We love our parents because they are the principles of our lives; hence we love them more objectively *(appreciative')*. A husband loves his wife because the wife is joined to him in "one flesh." Therefore the wife is loved more intensely, while more reverence is shown to the parents.123 These norms are given in the supposition that an equal necessity prevails in a given case. A real test of their practicality would take place in a case of extreme necessity. In this case it would seem that the parents would be preferred before all others, since they have given life to their children.124 In the case which is so often

123 Farrell, *op. cit.,* I, p. 316.

128 St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae,* II-II, q. 26, a. 11; cf. also: Farrelt, *op. cit.,* Ill, p. 82 sq.; Ostheimer, Anthony L., *The Family: A <jThomistic Study in Social Philosophy* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University Press, 1939), p. 79.

124 Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* I, p. 699.

presented as an example, that of the capsized boat, it is a general rule that the husband should rescue his mother in preference to his wife, all other conditions being equal. In a case of grave necessity, however, it would seem that the husband's love for his wife would take precedence. For example, if both his wife and his mother were gravely ill, he would be bound first to care for his wife.[120]

There are many other qualities that we could add to the notion of conjugal love, but that is not to our purpose to consider them, nor, moreover, would it serve any vital need. Most of the theological treatises enumerate these qualities, and they are readily applied by anyone in light of the nature of conjugal love. And, too, any enumeration that we might attempt would necessarily be inadequate. We believe that we have treated those qualities which flow most proximately from the nature of conjugal love, and without which our treatment would have been incomplete. With the termination of this question, we may now proceed to the considerations embodied in the topic of our next article, the necessity of conjugal love.

ARTICLE V. THE NECESSITY OF CONJUGAL LOVE

In treating the necessity of conjugal love, we will inquire whether it is necessary in the sense that it is essential to the notion of marriage, or whether it must remain outside this essential notion as a condition promoting the smooth operation of marriage. First of all, let us state that conjugal love is not essential in the sense that once it has ceased to exist, the marriage itself can be considered as having been dissolved.[128] This is conjugal love considered as a virtue. It is only when we view conjugal love as an *end* towards which marriage of its nature tends, that we can state that conjugal love is essential or necessary to marriage. Ford proves this rather conclusively, so we feel there is no need to repeat his arguments.[121] We would, however, repeat a caution which he advances in regard to this matter: "In a marriage in which for one reason

™*Ibid.*

120 Cf. Zeiger, *op. cit.,* p. 45*, for a complete inquiry on this question: cf., also: Aertnys-Damen, *op. cit.,* II, p. 470.

121 Ford, *op. cit.,* pp. 362-64.

or another one of the ends (or all of them) is unattainable, it still remains that marriage is *related* to that end, inasmuch as the marriage bond always consists in a right to the acts by which that end is attainable."J-8 In stating this caution, we thus avoid the necessity of refuting anyone who might contend that conjugal love is not essential, adducing as proof the numerous divorces and separations which have occurred because of its death. The statement of Zeiger that *(imatrimonium in facto esse* in its essential concept does not contain conjugal love, as long as it is considered juridically,"129 might also appear to go against our contention, were it not that a clear investigation of the context of Zeiger's statements proves otherwise. He does not say that conjugal love is excluded as an essential end of marriage. What he actually says is that marriage considered as the contractual consent does not contain conjugal love as the natural virtue and as the supernatural virtue.130 As his statement stands, it is neither for nor against our contention. Thus our original contention remains unchanged: conjugal love, as an end towards which marriage tends, is essential to the notion of marriage.

Related closely to its consideration as an end of marriage is its consideration as a virtue. There is no doubt that in this light conjugal love is not essential to marriage. Both Zeiger and Ford, who treat this topic at somewhat greater length than other authors, hold this view. Ford clearly states that the actual virtue of conjugal love is not essential to marriage.131 Zeiger demonstrates his view by presenting for our consideration two cases; in each a valid marriage is contracted. One is successful, lasting until the death of one of the spouses. The other terminates after a few short months. The latter marriage failed, Zeiger says: "Because there is lacking an altogether necessary element: the harmony of hearts, the union of love. . ."132 Conjugal love thus can die. It was for

^*Ibid.,* p. 349.

Zeiger, *op. cit.,* p. 49*: "matrimonium in facto esse in suo conceptu essentiali amorem conjugalem non continet, dummodo mere juridice consideratur."

130 *Ibid.*

Ford, *op. cit.,* p. 360.

w Zeiger, *op. cit.,* p. 50*: "Quia deerat elementum omnino necessarium: concordia animorum, unio amoris. .

this reason that in the preceding article we qualified our statements on the permanency of conjugal love, by stating only that it *tends to be permanent.* To have stated without qualification that the virtue of conjugal love was permanent, would have been a denial of human nature itself. It would be like stating that there is no hate in the world, when as a matter of fact it surrounds us on all sides. The virtue of conjugal love then is not essential, inasmuch as it resides in man's subjective faculties, which are subject to change and instability, and hence can exist or not, dependent upon man's dispositions.

Although we are presented with a picture which reveals to us that conjugal love can die in particular cases, this does not belie the fact that this virtue is most necessary if marriage is to succeed. We believe no stronger statement on the necessity of conjugal love can be found than that of Pope Pius XI: "On the other hand, the house built upon a rock, that is to say on mutual conjugal charity and strengthened by a deliberate and constant union of spirit, will not only never fall away but will never be shaken by adversity."[183] Zeiger also speaks of this necessity when he says: "From the character of human nature and hence from the will of God, the founder of nature and especially of the Christian order, there arises the greatest appositeness, nay even a certain necessity of conjugal love."[184] Gasparri indicates the particular type of necessity to which Zeiger refers when he says: "The union of souls and goods is not an object of the matrimonial contract, *but is a necessary condition* in order that the marriage might obtain happy results, along with the endurance of the burden it contains. . ."[185] Wernz-Vidal in

[183] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 569 f.; "At contra, quae supra petram constituta fuerit domus, mutua nempe inter coniuges caritate, et deliberata ac constanti animorum coniunctione solidata, nulla concutietur adversitate, nedum evertetur." (PPt, p. 24); cf. also Vermeersch, *IVhat Is Marriage?* pp. 58-59.

Zeiger, *op. cit.,* p. 53: "Simul ex indole naturae humanae et proin ex voluntate Dei, conditoris naturae et praesertim ordinis christiani eruitur maxima convenientia, immo necessitas quaedam amoris coniugalis."

[185] Gasparri, *op. cit.,* I, p. 16: "Unio autem animorum et bonorum non est obiectum matrimonialis contractus, sed est conditio necessaria ut matrimonium felices sortiatur exitus, et ad illius onera sustinenda. . ." (Italics mine.)

lending their approbation to this statement almost repeat Gasparri's words.[136] Furthermore, Gasparri adds: "matrimony, as the most intimate of all societies, requires mutual love more than any other factor, in order that it may flourish abundantly."[187] Probably the most conclusive statement on the necessity of conjugal love, however, is the following, which is also taken from Zeiger: "Nor can a *society* be considered *truly conjugal* without the consideration, at the same time, of that most necessary element, the foundation on which this society is built, conjugal love."[188] What these theologians teach concerning the necessity of conjugal love is borne out in the lives of all married couples. There are countless incidents which happen in their lives to show its need. In the first months of married life their love is strong, and consequently it easily sweeps aside anything that threatens to destroy it. But as time passes love seems to wane because of its continual battle to overcome obstacles. Troubles once lightly passed by loom ever larger each succeeding time they are faced. For this reason the spouses should strive always to keep their love strong and healthy, ever strengthening it. In this manner they will never have to worry that the trials they face will become obstacles to their happiness. Instead their love continually renewed and strengthened will convert these trials into so many aids through which the success of their married life will be best insured and guaranteed. Gerald Vann speaks appropriately on this subject. He says on the one hand: "the stuff of married life is the daily work, the daily drudgery; all the burdens which the care of children involves; the economic anxieties; the responsibilities. . ,"[159] But, on the other hand, he says: "There is the deep, underlying joy, there is the long happiness of comradeship, there are the moments of glory; these, too, are essential, for they are love, and it is love which turns drudgery into joy."[140]

136 Wernz-Vidal, *op. cit.,* V, p. 44.

187 Gasparri, *op. cit.,* I, p. 16: "matrimonium esse societatem inter omnes, quae excogitari possunt, summe intimam, quae, ut bene vergat, mutuum amorem prae ceteris omnibus requirit."

138 Zeiger, *op. cit.,* p. 50*: "Nec potest cogitari *societas vere coniugalis* per totjm vitam producta, quin simul cogitetur elementum illud maxime necessarium, fundamentum, cui superstruitur, sci., amor coniugalis."

Vann, *op. cit.,* p. 185.

J" Ibid.

Conjugal love, then, is a necessity. With it the trials of marriage become so many occasions of joy and happiness; without it they become as so many weapons which seek to destroy the institution in which they are found. It is essential in the sense that in by far the greater number of cases, those ends, to which marriage by its nature tends, cannot be attained without it.

ARTICLE VI, CONJUGAL LOVE: ITS EFFECTS ON THE SPOUSES

The first effect of conjugal love on the spouses is the union of mind and heart into which they are drawn. As we have already seen, it is of the nature of this love that such a union be accomplished.[141] A union is necessary if the purposes for which marriage exists are to be accomplished. In the attainment of the ends toward which marriage of itself tends, and of those personal benefits which the spouses themselves intend, one cannot fail to insert in the picture this important element. In speaking of the part that true marriage plays in providing for the proper multiplication of mankind, Vermeersch declares that in advance of the corporal union there is required in the spouses a sincere affection uniting their souls.[142] And in so far as personal considerations are concerned, a stalemate would certainly exist if there were to be disagreement on all of the issues which the spouses must necessarily face in their married life. Vann speaking in this vein states:

> In the sphere of mind there is the long and laborious process, not indeed of coming to agree on every conceivable issue, but of reaching a real and stable sympathy of mind, a real unity on great issues, a real mutual complementing of the two different ways of thought; finally there has to be the unity of the deep personal will, not again that there can ever be a complete agreement of desire in every superficial and transient issue, but that beneath the .surface-differences there may be a solid core of unity which nothing can shake.[143]

[140] *Supra,* p. 37.

[141] Vermeersch, FFAat *Is Marriage?* p. 17.

[142] Vann, *op. cit.,* pp. 184-85.

This is the unity which conjugal love effects; through it the spouses will find a most efficacious means of meeting and solving their problems. Ultimately they will find it to be their most effective contribution to the success and happiness of their marriage.

The second effect of conjugal love is the order that it sets up between the spouses. Pope Pius XI states:

> Domestic society being confirmed, therefore, by this bond of love, there should flourish in it that "order of love," as St. Augustine calls it. This order includes both the primacy of the husband with regard to the wife and children, the ready subjection of the wife and her willing obedience, which the Apostle commends in these words: "Let women be subject to their husbands as to the Lord, because the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church."[144]

The husband is the head of the wife and the family, and, therefore, to him belongs the power of governing not only the children and familial affairs, but also his wife, who, however, is to be treated not as a slave, but as a worthy companion.[146] De Smet expresses this idea very pointedly when he says: "The wife ought to be subject to her husband . . . however, the headship of the husband is formed most excellently with mutual love, nay rather it is tempered by mutual love: the wife is not to be considered as a handmaid, but as a loving companion."[148] The wife ought to revere her husband, as her head and governor, and should bestow

[144] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 549 f.: "Firmata denique huius caritatis vinculo domestica societate, floreat in ea necesse est ille, qui ab Augustino vocatur *ordo amoris.* Qui quidem ordo et viri primatum in uxorem et liberos, et uxoris promptam nec invitam subiectionem obtemperationemque complectitur, quam commendat Apostolus his verbis: *'Mulieres viris suis subditae sint sicut Domino; quoniam vir caput est mulieris, sicut Christus caput est Ecclesiae'* (Eph. 5:22)."

[146] Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* II, p. 809.

[148] De Smet, AI., *De Sponsalibus Et Matrimonio* (4th ed., Belgium: 'rJeyaert, 1927), p. 233: "Uxor debet esse subdita marito . . . principatus autem viri optime consistit cum amore mutuo, imo mutua dilectione temperatur: non est habenda uxor ut ancilla, sed ut dilecta socia. . ."

on him due obedience. She should also expend sedulous care in domestic affairs, according as conditions warrant; she should obey her husband in the government of the household and in matters that pertain to good morals.[147] It might be well to note here a regrettable tendency that seems to have crept in to disturb this natural and harmonious relationship of husband and wife. This is the demand of many women to be set on an equal footing with their husbands—the so-called equality of rights between the sexes. It must be remembered that we are not speaking here of that rightful equality which must be in existence between the spouses, and which Vermeersch so marvelously sums up in these words:

> The wife keeps the independence of a human person; she remains free in her personal conduct, in her practices of piety, in her goings and comings, with due consideration of the conjugal pact and the order of the house and family; she preserves the right to demand of the husband whatever her quality as wife and mother entitles her to, for she, too, has charge of the education of the children. Finally, as the husband and wife were equal in giving themselves each to the other, so they remain equal in regard to the right which flows from this mutual self-surrender.[148]

Our present Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, points out that this so-called "equality of rights" entails on the part of the wife the "depreciation of her true dignity and the solid foundation of all her rights which is her characteristic feminine role, and the intimate coordination of the sexes."[149] He thus declares the jeopardy into which this union is placed when the wife trespasses her legal bounds and infringes upon the rights, naturally bestowed, of her husband. When this happens, frictions arise, and instead of union there is disagreement. To remove these difficulties the first step is to find their source. Most probably it lies in the fear of the wife

[117] Merkelbach, *op. cit.*, II, p. 810.

[118] Vermeersch, *What Is Marriage?* pp. 23-24.

[149] Pope Pius XII, "Woman's Duties in Social and Political Life," An Address delivered on Oct. 21, 1945; N.C.W.C. trans., p. 6.

that she wifi be considered inferior, or even degraded by her position of subjection. Such a fear would be removed if the true implications of her position were made known to her. The author of the book, "Life Together," asks: "Is the Church humiliated in her subjection to Christ, her Head? Or is she not on the contrary ennobled by her subjection, and able by it to achieve perfect unity with Him, which would otherwise be quite impossible?"[180] The wife's role, then, in natural subjection to her husband, in no way implies degradation; the contrary is true. On the other hand, however, she may assure herself that any abandonment of her natural role and the consequent assumption of the rights of a false equality with her husband will almost certainly lead to that degradation which she fears, a situation of w'hich our Holy Father was well aware. His predecessor, Pope Pius XI, had been sufficiently alarmed to warn that:

> this false liberty and unnatural equality with the husband is to the detriment of the woman herself; for if the woman descends from the truly regal throne to which she has been raised within the walls of the home by means of the Gospel, she will soon be reduced to the old state of slavery (if not in appearance, certainly in reality) and become as amongst the pagans the mere instrument of man.[181]

Thus the wife should always be careful to accept this state of subjection, if she really desires to safeguard her own best interests. In this way only, will the unity of souls which this love achieves be effectively preserved. St. Alphonsus goes so far as to say that this subjection is actually a means of fostering love. He declares: "The reason for the subjection is this: it is most expedient for the peace of the family, for fostering mutual love, that the wife

[180] Hope, Wingfield, *Life Together* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1944), p. 93.

[181] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit., 567 i.*: "Quin immo in ipsius mulieris perniciem vertitur haec falsa libertas et non naturalis cum viro aequalitas; nam si jrmulier ab regia illa descendit sede, ad quam per Evangelium intra domesticos parietes evecta est, brevi in veterem servitutem (sin minus specie, re tamen vera) redigetur, fietque, ut apud ethnicos erat, merum viri instrumentum."

desire to be totally dependent upon her husband."[152] In connection with her position of subjection, it might be well to note at this time, somewhat as a corollary, these words of Pope Pius XI: "For if the man is head, the woman is the heart, and as he occupies the chief place in ruling, so she may and ought to claim for herself the chief place in love."[163] The woman because of the virtues with which God has endowed her is naturally fitted for the task of love. So she, rather than her husband, should take the lead in seeing that an atmosphere of love prevails over the household. Leclercq remarks appropriately:

> A being of passion, clinging to the concrete, woman has a quite understandable tendency to put her life in love. . . . Accordingly, she gives herself up to love more than man does. Love takes up the whole of the woman's life; it transcends the simple problem of carnal satisfactions; it completely overruns the psychical sphere. Moral union, sentimental and spiritual, with the one whom she loves takes the chief place in her love.[161]

The woman in doing this is in no way usurping a right of her husband, but in complete accord with the principles by which she is subject to him, she fulfills a task that naturally belongs to her.

ARTICLE VII. CONJUGAL LOVE AND ITS RELATION TO THE CONJUGAL ACT

Since the conjugal act, the right to which is the central object of the matrimonial contract, plays such an important role in marriage, it becomes necessary in virtue of that role to discuss it in its relationship to the virtue of conjugal love. We have already seen that this love consists principally in the union of the souls of the

[161] St. Alphonsus, *Theologia Moralis* (Lib. III, Tract. II, 9th ed. Rome: Vatican, 1905), I, p. 522, Gaudè; "Et ratio (subjectionis) est: quia expedit valde ad pacem familiae, ad mutuum amorem fovendum, quod uxor voluntatem totaliter a viro dependentem habeat. . ."

[162] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 549 f.: "Si enim vir est caput, mulier est cor, et sicut ille principatum tenet regiminis, haec amoris principatum sibi ut proprium vindicare potest et debet." (PPt, p. 9.)

[163] Leclercq, *op, cit.,* p. 295.

spouses. We can best state its relationship to the conjugal act if we say that the physical union is the completion and at the same time the best physical expression of the moral union existing between the spouses. First of all it is completion. In conjugal love both appetites which form a part of the human composite have their function,[155] although this does not necessarily imply that both will be in evidence in every particular act of love. For example, if one were considering the essential structure of conjugal love, one would find it consists principally in the union of souls of the spouses, a union in which only the appetites that pertain to the spiritual sphere of man have a part. To give conjugal love its integrity the corporal aspect would also have to be included. This takes place when the physical act of marriage is consummated. Mersch remarks that "the very thing that renders it (the conjugal act) appetible is that it is the sensible and corporal aspect of love and that it completes a man in that way."[150] The completion to which he refers evidently takes place after the inclusion of this appetite. Man is thus completed in the sense that he has brought into use both of these appetites in his act of love.

At the same time this physical union is the best *physical* expression of the moral union that has already been perfected. The union of souls is aptly expressed in the union of bodies; even more it seems to embody itself in that physical union: "Given the unity of the human composite and the close connection between our souls and our bodies, to arouse this activity is to make love itself pass into act. . . . Whether one wishes it or not, the emotion which accompanies the activity of which we are speaking is the psychological bond through which our will is engaged in our organism and is held there."[151] Bonnar states very clearly that this act is an expression of mutual love:

> As the most complete physical expression of mutual love that is possible, it (the conjugal act) festers and increases that love. As all love is a desire for union with the person loved, so this physical union promotes, and is the com-

Supra, p. 38.
w Mersch, *op. cit.,* p. 213.
167 Ibid.

> plement of, that union of mind and heart which is the nobler part of love. It is because of the intimate unity and inter-relation of soul and body that physical sexual union fosters and increases love.[168]

Ford is somewhat more emphatic in declaring his sentiments:

> And what acts can be imagined which could more perfectly serve the purpose of love than these? In the marriage act there is a living union of the most intimate and comprehensive kind—a union of body and mind, of sense and heart. When properly performed, it is an act not only of the rational love of benevolence and concupiscence, but also of sensitive and sexual love. It is an act of self-surrender in which two become one flesh, one principle of generation. Love desires union with the beloved by a communication of good. Can one discover a more appropriate act for the expression and fulfillment of love than the marriage act?[169]

Leclercq sheds some light on this relationship. His remarks are not directly ordained to our case here, but take the form of a warning against the dangers present in intimacies between single persons of different sex. "People forget. . . that the two sexes were created for the sake of physical union, and that the attraction which draws them together tends naturally toward such a union. It is therefore entirely normal for an intimate union of any kind to turn into a physical union, unless the greatest vigilance be exercised."[180] The application is obvious. The spouses united in the bonds of closest intimacy by conjugal love naturally tend to a physical union. The view that we are presenting here takes upon itself more credence in the light of man's nature, which demands such concrete expressions as the marital act as a proof of love. If man does not have these, his love tends to die out. Constant stimulation is necessary to keep it strong and healthy. Moreover, physical union bears with it the note of totality. The spouses have now given all

Bonnar, *op. cit.,* p. 57.

[169] Ford, *op. cit.,* p. 359; cf. also: Farrell, *op. cit.,* III, p. 439; IV, p. 144; Von Hildebrand, *op. cit.,* p. 16.

[180] Leclercq, *op. cit.,* p. 127.

that they can give to each other; they have surrendered themselves fully; theirs is a total love, a complete union. In the words of Leclercq: "it (the union of souls) does not lead to physical union save in so far as the latter is a sign or expression of the complete union of the lovers. Physical love is the token of total intimacy. It is the sign that the lovers have nothing to refuse each other."[161] All things considered, if one would refuse to admit that the conjugal act is the best physical expression of conjugal love, he would at least have to admit that it is a most fitting and most proper expression of this love.

The physical union, by the very fact that it is a token, an expression of the moral union of the spouses, also tends to increase and foster that mutual love. De Smet brings this point out most clearly when he declares: "That marital *union,,* by which the spouses become one flesh, also fosters and *nourishes* this love."[162] It does this because of the realization on the part of the spouses of the factors involved in this act. They sense the surrender of a portion of self which heretofore they have guarded with the greatest modesty. Their surrender is now total and complete. It is true that it is a physical union, but it is so completely bound up with man's spiritual faculties that it can be said that the whole person is now absorbed in it. The impression that the physical is to be completely separated from the spiritual probably stems from the separate treatment usually accorded this subject by the authors. The truth is, that in this action man's spiritual faculties are also engaged. Their role in directing man's bodily actions must be considered as having more importance than the resulting physical actions themselves. Authors who treat of this characteristic of the physical union are content merely to confirm what has already been said. It will be sufficient therefore to mention a few of their names. They are: Aertnys-Damen,[168] Vermeersch/[64] and Griese.[160] In this

in Ibid., p. 9.

[161]De Smet, *op. cit.,* p. *232:* "Hunc etiam amorem fovet et *nutrit* ipsa maritalis *copula,* qua una caro efficiuntur nupti. . ."

[108] Aertnys-Damen, *op. cit.,* II, p. 640.

[W] Vermeersch, *Theologiae Moralis,* IV, p. 71.

[ae]Griese, N. Orville, *The "Rhythm" in Marriage and Christian Morality* (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1944), p. 62.

connection it is well to note what Aertnys-Damen say of those acts which by their nature are accessory to the conjugal act: "The accessories are said to be all those things which by their nature are ordained to *copula,* such as kisses, embraces, etc·, . . . and dispose the spouses for the act itself. These acts, if they are *chasteN'ii* are destined by their nature to signify love."[187] As long as there is no danger of pollution, it is not necessary that these acts be ordained to the performance of the marriage act at this particular time.[188] Apart from this they may be performed just for the sake of fostering mutual love. If this can be said of the accessory acts, how much more will it apply to the conjugal act itself. Surely, it must foster and increase the mutual love of the spouses^

Our thoughts now turn to the question whether the marriage act is necessary for the expression of mutual love. Is it necessary that the marriage act be performed at certain times in order that mutual love be increased or that its diminution may be prevented? Relative to this question we are first compelled to note that marriage itself can exist without the marriage ever being consummated. It is sufficient for a valid marriage that only the right to the conjugal act be bestowed by the parties concerned; for they can mutually agree to refrain from the use of this right which they possess. So conjugal love can be expressed, can be fostered,without ever resorting to the conjugal act. We think this to be the opinion of St. Augustine when he says:

> And we know many of our brethren bringing forth fruit through grace, who in the name of Christ by mutual consent keep from one another the concupiscence of the flesh, but yet who do not keep from one another conjugal charity. . . . Are there not then spouses who so live, not seeking from each other the fruit of the flesh nor demanding from each other the debt of bodily concupiscence.[180]

"•These acts are chaste if they prepare the spouses for the conjugal act. Aertnys-Damen, *op. cit.,* II, p. 660: "Accessoria dicuntur ea omnia, quae suapte natura ad concubitum referuntur, uti sunt oscula, amplexus. . . Actus illi, si *pudici* sunt, etiam ad amorem significandum a natura destinati sunt. '

[168] *Ibid.*

[108] St. Augustine, Sermo LI, *In Generationibus Domini,* Cap. 13 (P.L. 38, 344): "Et multos novimus fratres nostros fructificantes in gratia, in nomine Christi ex consensu ab invicem continere concupiscentiam carnis, non autem

On the other hand St, Paul advises ; "Do not deprive each other, except perhaps by consent, for a time, that you may give yourselves to prayer ; and return together again lest Satan tempt you because you lack self-control."[170] In a similar manner conjugal relations are necessary at times to promote mutual love. Speaking of this Cappello says : "Neither spouse *per se* is bound to seek the *debitum,* because no one is bound to use a thing which is a right. . . . *Per accidens,* however, such an obligation can exist, especially in the husband ... if the use of matrimony is necessary to foster love or to avoid disagreements."[171] And he adds: "It is manifest that an obligation of this kind is *per se grave.* The object of the mutual contract is a grave matter ; the generation of offspring, the avoidance of incontinence, the signification of love for the safeguarding of domestic peace."[172] Perhaps a statement more conformable to the view we wish to express is the one made by Griese : "Even among those who experience normal sexual impulses, the love between man and wife depends at least to some degree, on normal sexual relations."[173] Bonnar states: "Sexual intercourse should be exercised, it goes without saying, in moderation and with charitable consideration. But, taking this for granted, sexual intercourse is necessary in married life to foster and preserve love between husband and wife. It is the great act of union and personal surrender and, without it, married life is incomplete and crippled, love is undermined."[174] Finally, this necessity is revealed in a

continere ab invicem charitatem conjugalem. . . . Nonne sunt conjuges qui sic vivunt, non quaerentes ab invicem fructum carnis non exigentes ab invicem debitum concupiscentiae corporalis?"

[170] 1 Cor. 7:5.

[171] Cappello, *op. cit.,* p. 805 : "'Neuter conjux *Per se* tenetur *petere* debitum, quia nemo tenetur uti jure suo. *Per accidens* autem potest adesse obligatio petendi, praesertim in viro ... si usus matrimonii necessarius est ad fovendum amorem vel ad dissidia avertenda." ; cf. also : H. Noldin, S.J., and A. Schmitt, S.J., *De Sexto Praecepto et De Usu Matrimonii* (31st ed., Oeniponte; Rauch, 1940), p. 92; Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 964.

[17a] Cappello, *op. cit.,* p. 805: "Hujusmodi obligationem *per se* esse *gravem,* manifestum est. Objectum mutui contractus est res gravis; generatio prolis, u incontinentia vitanda, significatio amoris pro pace domestica tuenda."

[179] Griese, *The "Rhythm" in Marriage and Christian Morality,* p. 63.

[174] Bonnar, *op. cit.,* p. 49.

warning voiced by theologians about the practice of "Rhythm" in marriage. It is their opinion that it *can* lead to a diminution of love.[175] Moreover, we may note two specific facts in regard to this necessity, one which concerns the man, the other the woman. Leclercq sums these up admirably in the following statement:

> Man is inclined more towards physical love. Taking the word in its usual meaning, the sex instinct will be said to be more developed in him; on the other hand, woman's affective needs are greater. Where the man wants physical pleasure, the woman wants tokens of affection and the acts of endearment that express it. . . . The normal order requires that man bestow upon the woman the marks of affection that she needs, in order that she may in turn accord him the physical gratification which he demands.[176]

The question now arises, whether the fostering of love as such, i.e., distinct from the mere desire of pleasure, is a sufficient reason in itself to justify conjugal intercourse. We think the Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, answered this question when he said:

> Nor are those considered as acting against nature who in the married state use their right in the proper manner, although on account of natural reasons either of time or certain defects, new life cannot be brought forth. For in matrimony as well as in the use of the matrimonial rights there are also secondary ends, such as mutual aid, the cultivating of mutual love, and the quieting of concupiscence which the husband and wife are not forbidden to consider so long as they are subordinated to the primary end and so long as the intrinsic nature of the act is preserved.[177]

[175] Cf. Aertnys-Damen, II, *649;* Griese, *The "Rhythm" in Marriage and Christian Morality,* pp. 61-63; Bonnar, *op, cit.,* p. 49.

[176] Leclercq, *op. cit.,* p. 123.

[177] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 561 f.: "Neque contra naturae ordinem agere ii dicendi sunt coniuges, qui iure suo recta et naturali ratione utuntur, etsi ob naturales sive temporis sive quorundam defectuum causas nova inde vita oriri non possit. Habentur enim tam in ipso matrimonio quam in coniugalis iuris usu etiam secundarii fines, ut sunt mutuum adjutorium mutuusque fovendus amor et concupiscentiae sedatio, quos intendere coniuges minime vetantur, dummodo salva semper sit intrinseca illius actus natura ideoque eius ad primarium finem debita ordinatio." (PPt, p. 18.)

Among the many authors who would support such a view, we have, for example, Cappello who states: "There are many ends for which the conjugal act can be performed. Some are proper and essential, others improper and accidental. . . . The improper and accidental are e.g., mutual love to be fostered. . ."[178] Father Connell's opinion is also quite clear: "Certainly there are other ends to which nature ordains conjugal relations, especially the alleviation of sexual craving and the fostering of a deep and abiding love between husband and wife."[179] Thus we are able to say that conjugal relations entered into for the purpose of fostering conjugal love constitute a good and meritorious act, even though there is no explicit intention of attaining the primary end, as long as this end is not positively frustrated.

It is useless to state that the physical union of husband and wife is the best physical expression of mutual love or that it increases this love, unless by this union is meant a physical union in conformity with the laws of God and of nature. Such a condition cannot be overlooked where true love is concerned. As Payen contends, it is only by the chaste generation and education of offspring that mutual love between the spouses is fostered.[180] Otherwise, the action not only fails in the purpose which it sets out to achieve, but even turns upon itself and becomes self-destructive. As Vann declares: Love is always outward-turning, always an impulsion to making; and if you wilfully frustrate it and turn it upon itself, it becomes destructive and may well in the end become self-destructive."[181] Vermeersch not only accepts this view but states the reasons upon which it is based. Such artificial relations as the practice of birth control cannot, as he says: "serve the purposes of true love, for true love is partly founded on mutual respect, which moral disorder must necessarily weaken."[182] In much the

178 Cappello, *op. cit.,* p. 797; cf. also: Vermeersch, *What Is Marriage?* p. 43.

179 Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., "Birth Control: The Case for the Catholic," The Atlantic Monthly, 165 (1939), p. 469.

180 Payen, *op. cit.,* I, p. 81.

AVann, Gerald, O.P., *The Heart of Man* (New York: Longman, 1945), p. 107.

Vermeersch, *What Is Marriage?* p. 25 and p. 45.

same words Payen reasons: "In that it (onanism) takes away mutual reverence, it extinguishes *'mutual conjugal love*."[183] Moreover, it would be difficult to see how a physical union, which brings injury to the parties concerned, could even express love, not alone attempt to increase it. And injury to the parties is the result when the physical union does not take place in accordance with the laws of God. Vermeersch points this out when he declares: "these laws of God sanction an order of mutual relations which is for the good of the parties. The partner who violates that order does an injury to the other party, which is manifestly contrary to conjugal fidelity, since that demands mutual helpfulness."[184] Hence we may conclude that a chaste physical union is not only the most proper but also the most advantageous means of expressing love; while an unchaste union is not only improper, but a distinct liability.

In closing this phase of our treatment we have seen that the physical union is the completion and at the same time the best physical expression of the moral union that is in existence between the spouses. Just as we see in man's nature the necessity at certain times for a concrete expression of sincerity, etc., so also we recognize a periodic necessity in the husband and wife for such concrete expressions as the marital act as a proof of their love. Over and above this, there is at times a necessity that they perform this act to nourish and increase this love. Finally, this manner of expressing love is an appropriate one, in the fulfillment of which the spouses are also acting for the accomplishment of a greater and higher good. For God has decided this act to be the means whereby his own command to the human race "to increase and to multiply" will be brought to pass. Thus in the very expression of their common love, the husband and wife have already the means whereby that love will produce its fruit.

ARTICLE VIII. CONJUGAL LOVE AND ITS RELATION TO THE CHILD

In discussing the specific difference of conjugal love, we showed that there was an internal relation existing between this love and

Payen, *op. cit.,* II, p. 424: "Eo enim ipso quod mutuam tollit reverentiam, *mutuum amorem conjugalem* . . . exstinguit"; cf. also Aertnys-Damen, II, p. 646.

Vermeersch, *What Is Marriage?* p. 21.

the primary end of marriage.[185] Our purpose in this article is to point out the relationship between the virtue of conjugal love and the primary end as objectively realized in the child. First, we wish to recall a statement that we made in our previous article. The union of souls, the basis of conjugal love, *tends* by its nature to the physical union of bodies.[186] Once that act is placed, and assuming that nature will cooperate perfectly in this instance, the ground is laid for the birth of the child. The union of souls resulting in a union of bodies thus produces the term of love, the child.

> In the child the married couple's unity is realized in an absolute fashion, whereas the love union can never bring about such a fusion of the couple that they really form but a single being. The child is the couple's unity realized and projected outside themselves. Each spouse rediscovers the other in the child, and also finds himself anew.[187]

In connection with this notion Payen speaks of the child as the fruit of the parent's love: "in the common fruit of a common love, that is in the child."[188] Farrell uses a somewhat stronger term. He says: "the child is a perfect expression of love; here is a union that is the embodiment of the mother and father. . ."[180] And to again quote Leclercq: "The child, then, is closely bound up with conjugal love. He is the fruit of love, and its most potent stimulant."[100] Figurative as these statements may seem, they have a basis in fact. They are striving to express the truth that it is "love that begets the child."[101] First of all, the composition of conjugal love is involved, both its corporal and spiritual aspects, for it is of the integral conjugal love that we must speak. It would not be totally correct to speak of one of its aspects, and call it the whole conjugal love. One should be especially careful in speaking

[185] *Supra,* p. 47.

** *Supra,* p. 74.

[101] Leclercq, *op. cit.,* p. 10.

[188] Payen, *op. oit.,* II, p. 425; "in communi fructu communis amoris, id est in prole."

[180]Farrell, *op. cit.,* IV, p. 408.

[100] Leclercq, *op, cit.,* p. 11.

** [101] *Ibid.,* p. 14.

of the spiritual side of conjugal love in this manner, for it is the exceptional case wherein the spiritual is not expressed by the physical, i.e,, where the union of souls does not end in the union of bodies. Although primarily the union of souls is to be considered in conjugal love, yet it tends by its nature to the physical union. Love then brings about the physical union of the spouses, and supposing the ideal case where nature fully cooperates, the child is conceived. He is in a real sense the fruit of their love. Some may object that love is not always present as a preliminary to the action itself, and their assertion is quite true. The physical union quite often takes place not as a result of love, but as a desire for sensual gratification, or for other reasons. However, this does not obviate the fact that in the nature of things it ought to take place as a result of love, and in the majority of cases does that very thing. This fact is never more clearly stated than by Vermeersch when he declares that true marriage provides for the proper multiplication of humankind, by requiring in advance of the corporal union a sincere affection uniting the souls of the man and wife.[102] Likewise it becomes evident in the light of the necessity of conjugal love throughout every phase of their married life. Although this necessity is not absolute, it is almost a *conditio sine qua non for success.* Hence, in a very real sense, we think the child may be considered as the fruit of love.

If we view the statements of the theologians as they attempt to explain the procession of the Third Person of the Most Blessed Trinity, we find statements that confirm the thoughts expressed in the preceding paragraph. Scheeben states:

> The love with which Father and Son embrace each other in the communion of their goodness and lovableness, of their nature and essence, aims in its infinite fruit-fulness at transferring this same nature and essence to a third subject, a third hypostasis; and the bliss which these two enjoy in the possession of the same nature can achieve a real expression in no other way than by taking a third person into this communion, by sharing with a third the entire and indivisible good which they possess without losing it. The sigh of the divine love is therefore a per

[102] Vermeersch, *What Is Marriage?* p. 17.

> sonal sigh, a person, and a person distinct from them who breathe Him forth in their love. . .[103]

It is rather obvious that there is no comparison between Love as it produces the Holy Ghost in the Godhead, and as it begets the human child. Again Scheeben states:

> In a human soul the acts of cognition and love are accidents of the substance and the person. The intelligible word and the volitional love-impulse are at bottom really the same as the completed acts of cognition and love, and hence are themselves accidents of the human substance and person. To be persons, they would first of all have to be substantial. But they are not, and so they can serve only to perfect the person to whom they pertain. . . . The created person conveys not a substantial, but an accidental wisdom and love in his word and sigh; neither his word nor his sigh is a substance.[104]

In human beings love serves only to bring about the physical union from which the child results. It does not *directly* produce the child, but it does play a vital role. Love, however, would not be love if it did not seek to perpetuate itself. Mersch remarks: "Love is an act of the species, in this sense, that it is destined to perpetuate the species. . ."[105] Again, if we remember that the love of creatures participates to a certain degree, no matter how imperfect, in the love of their Creator, we will realize that their love will also partake of its power of creativeness. Indeed, God allows them to share in his plan of creation.

> God, in His love for men, had so much confidence in them and so much respect for them that He entrusted to them the conservation of their species. He has then, in creating them, implanted deep in their being, along with the instinct of self-preservation, another tendency almost equally energetic, and almost as completely identified with them. We mean conjugal love, the instinct of conservation of the species.[100]

[103] Scheeben, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-76.
[104] *Ibid*, pp. 77-78.
[105] Mersch, *op. cit.*, p. 210.
[100] *Ibid.*, p. 209.

While these statements are intended only as corroborative, yet they convey a strength of their own to the views presented. One has no difficulty in understanding the creativeness of God's own love, how the Love of Father and Son produces the Holy Ghost. So the way is paved for surmounting the difficulty over the creativeness of human love. And that is cleared away if it is understood that this love does not directly result in the child, but only disposes the spouses toward physical union, from whence the child is conceived.

Love also has a social aspect. We have already reported the words of Mersch in which he calls conjugal love "the instinct of conservation of the species." The idea which these words attempt to express is merely an extension of the notion that love begets the child. The child cannot be considered solely as an individual. He is a member of society; in fact, it is he, who with others like him, form this society. Apropos of this Mersch states:

> The species of which we speak, humanity in general, cannot exist in itself. Only individuals, only men, exist. It is by the multiplication of these that the species seeks to realize all the richness of the human type which it contains and to find itself quite entirely expressed.[187]

Inasmuch, then, as it is true to say that love begets the child, it will also be true to say that love conserves the species—love has a social aspect.

Finally, we speak of conjugal love in its relation to the education of the child. Conjugal love is singularly nourished in the education of the child, because of the selfless devotion which husband and wife must exhibit in the performance of this duty.[188] Father Cooper declares: "The mutual love of husband and wife finds its completion and fulfillment and final consecration in their common love of offspring, and is sustained, fed, and further purified by their common sacrificial and unselfish devotion to and protection and care of their children."[198] This pursuance of their common task has the

p. 210.

[188] Payen, *op. cit.,* I, p. 81.

Cooper, John M., *Birth Control* (Washington: N.C.W.C., 1923), p. 14.

effect of drawing them together in the bonds of closest friendship, the better that it might be carried out. McFadden states: "The child cements the love of husband and wife whose right and privilege it is to lead this child along the path to eternal happiness."[200] Vermeersch while voicing the same opinion takes pains to develop it somewhat more fully: "Besides the child cements the union of the parents; in the little quarrels which are almost inevitable he is the conciliating element; because he requires good example he is an educative factor, and makes the work of mutual upbuilding easier for the parents."[201] In serving as a focal point upon which their married life centers, the child is a powerful factor drawing the spouses together, causing them to make countless sacrifices of self in the interest of that new life which was the very purpose of their marriage. Indeed, this union of the spouses is a necessary condition to the proper upbringing of that child. For the child requires both its mother and its father. As Merkelbach states: "Since the offspring is the common good of the man and the woman, his care requires the society of both as long as he remains the good of both. . ."[202] Each, by virtue of the natural differentiation in the sexes, can make a vital contribution to the welfare of the child. The education of the child is thus shown to accomplish two important results in its relationship to conjugal love. While serving to bind the ties of this love more closely, at the same time it assures its own adequate attainment.

With this final consideration as the child as the term of love, we complete our treatment of the notion of conjugal love. We now turn our thoughts to love, as it is fortified and strengthened by the powers of supernatural grace. We propose that therein will be found the highest expression of the love of the spouses, i.e., when they desire, beyond anything else in marriage, their "mutual sanctification." This should be the primary object of every man and woman who enter upon Christian Marriage.

200 McFadden, Charles J., O.S.A., *Medical Ethics for Nurses* (Philadelphia: Davis, 1946), p. 109.

201 Vermeersch, *IVhat Is Marriage?* p. 18; Leclercq, *op. cit.,* p. 11.

303 Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 807: "Cum enim proles sit commune bonum viri et mulieris, eius cura requirit tamdiu societatem utriusque quamdiu remanet bonum utriusque. .

CHAPTER III

The Object of Conjugal Love—the Mutual Sanctification of the Spouses

In our previous chapter in which we treated the nature of conjugal love, we discussed it in so far as possible from the natural point of view. In this chapter we will treat it from the supernatural point of view, conjugal love as it is perfected, consecrated and elevated by the Sacrament of Matrimony. Primarily, the Sacrament will affect the manner in which the love operates, then the end or purpose which it has in view. It will also affect some of the qualities of this love, namely its permanence and exclusiveness; to the others it will add new meaning and new force in so far as these qualities will be informed by the virtue of charity. Because interest will center chiefly on the object of this supernatural conjugal love rather than on its nature, we will begin our treatment of this chapter by a discussion of this object—the "mutual sanctification" of the spouses—and show why we consider this to be the object. Following this we will examine briefly the nature of this love, and then conclude the discussion by considering the object in its relation to the general and primary purpose of marriage.

"To husband and wife, guarded and strengthened by the heavenly grace which His merits gained for them, He gave power to attain holiness in the married state,"[1]*These words spoken by the venerable Pontiff, Pope Leo XIII, set the stage, as it were, for our present considerations. For His Holiness was but stating that two persons united in the bonds of Christian marriage are enabled by that fact to achieve holiness of life. If one considers how two people united under such a bond are so inextricably bound

1Pope Leo XIII, *"Arcanum,"* ASS, 12 (1880), 388 f.: "simulque effecisse ut coniuges, caelesti gratia, quam merita eius pepererunt, septi ac muniti, sanctitatem in ipso coniugio adipiscerentur. . ." (PPt, p. 8.)

up in each other's lives, one does not wonder that their efforts to achieve such holiness are described as a search after "mutual sanctification." It does not take a great deal of effort to discover the truth of this statement. Each party has renounced his own life as a single individual in the interests of a common life with another. From the nature of marriage they are no longer two but one. As Christ has said: "Have you not read that the Creator, from the beginning, made them male and female, and said, 'For this cause a man shall leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh?' Therefore now they are no longer two, but one flesh."[9] Because of this the life of one will tend inexorably to have ità effect on the life of the other. No action will take place; not a word will pass between the two, which will not have its consequent reaction on both. With this in mind we consider the purpose of marriage. Its purpose is not only to bring forth children who are prospective, adopted sons of God, but also to give to the parents an opportunity of coming closer to their ultimate and final end, God Himself. But because of the peculiar nature of the married state, the spouses must seek this goal together. Such a striving after a common goal may thus be safely described as a striving after "mutual sanctification."

It would be well, as our initial consideration in this chapter, to point out the meaning of the term "sanctification," as it is to be understood in this thesis. In his encyclical on Christian Marriage, Pope Pius XI assigned to conjugal love the task of sanctification of the spouses. In so doing he defined sanctification as the help which the spouses should give one another in forming and perfecting themselves in the interior life. Through their partnership in life they are to advance ever more and more in virtue so as to grow in true love towards God and neighbor.[8] More formally, sanctification is the process through which one attains sanctity. This is the state in which man, cleansed from sin and detached from material considerations, adheres to God, his Highest Good and supreme norm of morality, and firmly applies himself and[9]

[9] Matt. 19:4-6.
[8] Pope Pius XI, *"Casti Connubit,"* 548 f.

his acts to God, his ultimate end and first principle. Commonly, sanctification is described as a process whereby a person acquires or increases the divine life of grace in his soul. Applied to marriage, it is the process whereby the spouses help one another to maintain and increase the divine life within each other. This does not happen directly, in the sense that the action of one spouse can produce grace in the soul of his partner. Indirectly it may happen, however, that one of the spouses will so dispose the other that he will be brought to act upon the *occasions* of grace as they are presented by this partner.[5] The gaining of the grace by the one spouse is thus a wholly independent action; but at the same time it must be realized that the action of the other spouse has a contributing effect to the result produced. This is aside from the fact, and this cannot be forgotten, that in so disposing his spouse to the attainment of grace he gains grace himself. This, then, is what we mean when we speak of the "sanctification" of the spouses.

Relative to conjugal love we propose that this sanctification take place in the following manner. First, the spouses should know that they perform a great act of love when they give and receive each other in marriage. For in being ministers of the Sacrament to each other, they become the instruments whereby each is enabled to acquire the graces that are attached to this sacramental union.[5] Secondly, and this will be the ordinary manner in which sanctification will take place in marriage, we propose that it come to pass by having the spouses act as dispensers (here we really mean occasions) of those actual graces which are due

[*] Merkelbach, B., O.P., *Summa Theologiae Moralis,* II, p. 686: "Est enim sanctitas status quo mens hominis, a peccato munda et ab inferioribus rebus abstracta, adhaeret Deo, Summo Bono et supremae normae moralitatis, ac seipsum et suos actus firmiter applicat Deo ultimo fini et primo principio."

[5] By occasions we mean opportunities presented to the spouses to gain those graces attached to the married state. Although both spouses are presented these opportunities, and though it is the ideal that both promptly cooperate in the attainment of these graces, it often happens that one of the spouses, prompted by the highest type of love, will give the incentive or inclination whereby the other is aroused to take advantage of the opportunities offered.

[5] "Scheeben, M. J., *The Mysteries of Christianity,* p. 607.

to the spouses in order that they may properly fulfill the duties of their state in life.[7] We know these actual graces are given to the spouses when they request them.[8]*Pope Pius XI echoes this teaching when he says: "Hence this sacrament not only increases sanctifying grace . . . but also adds particular gifts, seeds of grace. . . Finally, it grants them .the right to the actual assistance of grace, as often as they ask for it when they need it for fulfilling the duties of this state of life."[0] Vermeersch's commentary on the words of the Holy Father give an indication of a similar viewpoint:

> The Encyclical, therefore, distinguishes between a group of actual helps, which it calls particular gifts, good inclinations, seeds of grace (sanctifying grace is meant) . . . and a group of aids which are to go into operation only at the prayer of the parties to the marriage. The Encyclical thus attributes a special efficacy to the prayer of the parties to obtain what is necessary or useful to them in every situation in which they find themselves.[10]

The one condition to the granting of these graces is that no obstacle *{obex}* be placed in the way.[11] In other words the sacramental graces of marriage can be claimed only as long as the spouses remain in the state of grace. It would seem that no higher form of expression of conjugal love could be conceived than to have the spouses act as the occasions whereby their partners in marriage would be prompted to seek those actual graces to which they are entitled. In desiring and encouraging their part-

7 Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* Ill, p. 781.

8 It is the certain theological teaching contained in all the theologians that the spouses have a right to these graces. E.g., cf., Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* Ill, p. 781.

* Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 554 f.: "Hoc enim Sacramentum . . . non solum permanens vitae supernaturalis principium, gratiam scilicet sanctificantem, auget, sed etiam peculiaria addit dona . . . gratiae germina, . . ius denique iis concedit ad actuale gratiae auxilium toties impetrandum, quotiescumque ad munera huius status adimplenda eo indigent."

10 Vermeersch, A., S.J., *What Is Marriage?* p. 29.

11 Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 781.

ners to partake of such benefits, the spouses will certainly be willing properly *conjugal* benefits for each other. For these actual graces are given precisely for the fulfillment of the marital duties. These duties would include within their concept all the various activities of the husband and wife which comprise the term "mutual help" *(adjutorium mutuum)*. We thus stay within the limits of our definition of conjugal love, i.e,, the union by which husband and wife wish to give each other the martial benefits. Since this kind of sanctification seems to be in keeping with that indicated by the Holy Father, and since it seems to constitute a properly "conjugal" benefit, we, therefore, propose it as the proper object of conjugal love.

It is not strange that Pope Ptux XI should have assigned to conjugal love the task of sanctifying the spouses. It is only natural that love, which plays such a prominent part in the lives of all human beings, should be assigned the task of attaining man's highest and ultimate end, God Himself. When we consider how conjugal love is so intrinsically bound up with the nature of marriage, we can better understand how it is not able to function without taking upon itself some of the characteristics of marriage, specifically in this instance, the property of sanctity. Marriage of its nature, especially Christian Marriage, tends toward sanctity. Scheeben states that even natural marriage tends toward this end. He declares:

> The matrimonial union has a religious character even in view of its natural end. For there is question of bringing into the world new images of God, who are to honor and glorify God on earth from generation to generation. Therefore, all natural conditions necessary for the attainment of this end, and the union itself, have a religious basis, and the duties arising from the marriage state have, on account of this direct reference to God, a more sacred and holy character than all other natural or freely contracted obligations of men toward one another.[13]

More than any other form of marriage, Christian marriage lays claim to the title of leading spouses to the state of sanctity. To

[13] Scheeben, *op. cit.,* p. 595.

this end Christ Himself elevated marriage to the dignity of a Sacrament.13 By virtue of that elevation, grace, the greatest of all God's gifts to the human race, is imparted to the spouses that they may become the more closely united to God. As Merkelbach states: Matrimony confers: First, habitual grace. . . Second, a special sacramental grace which furnishes to the recipient a special aid and an habitual vigor . . . for holily fulfilling the marital duties and moderating concupiscence. . . Third, a right to the actual graces, necessary for obtaining this end. . A Through these graces the spouses are able to undertake the manifold obligations and duties that they must assume in married life. Besides this conjugal life brings to the spouses many special trials that must be borne, and difficulties that must be overcome. To do this they need the abundant help afforded by God's graces. Joyce remarks :

> The difficulties of married life have been recognized at all times. And it is manifest that much virtue and much self-sacrifice is needed, if the love of the partners is to remain undiminished and each is to aid the other in the service of God and the attainment of eternal fife. The sacrament of matrimony provides the graces requisite for this.18

Thus we see that Christian Marriage leads the spouses to sanctity. As evidence of this in the practical order, we have such married saints as St. Stephen, King of Hungary, St. Frances de Chantal, and St. Elizabeth (feast on July 8th), who embraced the married state, and afterwards were raised to the altar of sanctity.13 Since, therefore, Christian Marriage performs this salutary task (Leclercq indicates this when he says: "Marriage is a sacred institution. Its primary object is the formation through the husband

u Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* Ill, p, 773.

ulbid., pp. 780-81.

laJoyce, Geo. H., S.J., *Christian Marriage.' An Historical and Doctrinal Study,* p. 148.

wWe are not maintaining that these people gained their sanctity merely by getting married or only through marriage. It was certainly a contributing ^factor, however, in each of their lives,

and wife of what might be styled a holy environment . . ."[17]), Christian conjugal love ought also to be directed to that end. That this love by its very nature is directed to this end is a view corroborated by Pope Pius XI when he said:

> This outward expression of love in the home demands not only mutual help but must go further; must have as its primary purpose that man and wife will help each other day by day in forming and perfecting themselves in the interior life, so that through their partnership in life they may advance ever more in virtue, and above all that they may grow in true love towards God. . .[18]

Mutual sanctification is thus the object of conjugal love. Just as conjugal love because of its intrinsic relation to the primary end took upon itself the properties of natural marriage,[19] so now Christian conjugal love assumes the object of Christian Marriage.

That the sanctification of the spouses is the proper object of conjugal love may be shown first from Sacred Scripture. St. Paul in his celebrated Epistle to the Ephesians advises: "Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for her that he might sanctify her. . .'[20] Exegetes in commenting upon this passage almost unanimously focus their attention upon the comparison between the union of Christ and His Church and the union between husband and wife. Because of the union of Christ with His Church (this union gives grace[21]), they say it is indicated, and with a high degree of

[17] Leclercq, Jacques, *Marriage and the Family,* p. 68.

[18] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 548 f.: "Hoc autem opus in domestica societate non modo mutuum auxilium complectitur, verum etiam ad hoc extendatur oportet, immo hoc in primis intendat, ut coniuges inter se iuventur ad interiorem hominem plenius in dies conformandum perficiendumque; ita ut per se mutuam vitae consortionem in virtutibus magis magisque in dies proficiant, et praecipue in vera erga Deum . . . caritate crescant. . ." (PPt, p. 8.)

[19] *Supra,* p. 57.

[20] Eph. 5:25-26.

[21] Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 770: "*Est signum gratiae.* Significat enim unionem Christi cum Ecclesia; haec autem unio per gratiam perficitur, nam Christus dilexit Ecclesiam et seipsum tradidit pro ea ut illam *sanctificaret,* quod sine gratia fieri nequit; ergo matrimonium est gratiae signum."

probability, that the union of husband and wife is a sacramental one.[22] In the past so much emphasis was placed on this sacramental signification of the passage, there was a tendency to overlook its literal meaning—that St. Paul was proposing a standard or measure for the love of husband and wife. That St. Paul did intend such a meaning is borne out by the teaching of modem exegetes. For example, Prat states:

> The obligation of the husband includes love, devotion, and a constant care to assure the happiness of his wife, in imitation of Christ sacrificing himself for the Church. Sublime model for both of the Christian consorts! . . . St. Paul, for his part, wishes that the still closer union of Christ with his Church should serve as a rule and standard for the intimacy of the conjugal tie.[28]

Martindale, too, calls this to our attention, perhaps even more pointedly than Prat. Commenting on this text, he states: "It is remarkable not least because he proclaims a mighty dogma almost in passing, as something better known and *admitted* by all, and (note especially) uses it to reinforce a simple moral ideal that he recalls—in this case, union and love and mutual respect between husband and wife."[23] Following the same line of thought we have Joyce who remarks appropriately: "From the archetype the two spouses may gather their respective duties in the Christian home. The man is bound to love and cherish his wife as Christ loves the Church, the woman meanwhile owing obedience to her husband in all wifely duties."[28] Finally, we have Vostè who continues the same theme: "As the woman, therefore, ought to be subject to her husband (as the Church is subject to Christ), so the man ought to love his wife (as Christ loves the Church). . ."[20] Besides

[23] Joyce, *op. cit.,* p. 152.

[22] Prat, Fernand, S.J., *The Theology of St. Paul.* Trans, from the 10th French ed. by John L. Stoddard (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1927), II, p. 329.

[w] Martindale, C. C., S.J., *Wedlock,* p, 50.

[M] Joyce, *op. cit.,* p. 153.

[20] Vostè, Jacobo Maria, O.P., *Commentarius in Epistulam Ad Ephesios* (Romae: Collegio Angelico, 1932), p. 235: "Sicut mulier ergo debet subjici viro (prout Ecclesia subjecta est Christi), ita etiam vir diligere debet uxorem (sicut Christus Ecclesiam). . ."

proposing the standard for this love, we may also say that St. Paul wished to point out the proper object of this love. St. Paul says that husbands are to love their wives, just as Christ also loved the Church, He then points out that the purpose of Christ's love for his Church is that "he might sanctify her." If the husband is to imitate Christ, he, too, must love his wife in order to sanctify her. But in this case sanctification must take place in a different manner. The husband's love for his wife will not produce grace directly as in the case of Christ's love for his Church. However, it will so prompt him to take advantage of every opportunity in their married life to dispose her to gain those graces particularly appropriate to it. Thus, even though no direct sanctification takes place, the spouses still do all that is humanly possible that this may be brought about. It is in this sense that we say that St. Paul proposes sanctification as the object of conjugal love.

We believe this text we have quoted from St. Paul is sufficient proof of our contention; however, it is not the only proof that can be pointed to in Sacred Scripture. Always closely associated with the text of St Paul is that of St. Peter, who says: "In like manner also let wives be subject to their husbands; so that even if any do not believe the word, they may without word be won through the behavior of their wives."[27] We note that this text does not speak of love but of subjection. However, what is said of one, may be said of the other because of their close connection and inter-relation. Pope Pius XI pointed out this connection when he said: "Domestic society being confirmed, therefore, by this bond of love, there should flourish in it that 'order of love,' as St. Augustine calls it. This order includes both the primacy of the husband with regard to the wife and children, (and) the ready subjection of the wife. . ."[28] The purpose of this loving subjection is, as St. Peter states, "that even if any (husbands) do not believe the word, they may without word be won through the behavior of their

[27] 1 Peter 3:1.

[28] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 549 f.: "Firmata denique huius caritatis vinculo domestica societate, floreat in ea necesse est ille, qui ab Augustino vocatur *ordo amoris.* Qui quidem ordo et viri primatum in uxorem et liberos, et uxoris promptam . . . subiectionem. . ." (PPt, p. 8.)

wives." Clearly the purpose in evidence here is sanctification in the sense that unbelieving husbands may be brought to grace. To obtain the proper value of this conclusion in our thesis, we have but to advance a point or step in the chronological order. We suppose the result has been achieved, and the unbelieving husband has been won over by his wife's example. What, then, will be the purpose of the wife's subjection? It must be that the wife will act now so as to increase this divine life which has been planted in the soul of her husband and bring it to further fructification. This is but to carry out the text to its logical conclusion. Thus we see an indication, restricted though it may be, that mutual sanctification is the object of the mutual love of husband and wife.

As far as the teaching of the Fathers is concerned, we may state that it is substantially the same as that proclaimed in Sacred Scripture. For all intents and purposes, this is the doctrine of St. Paul. St. Ambrose is very definite in proclaiming the purpose of the husband's love for his wife. He states that husbands should so love their wives, that their wives may thereby become religious and holy. He declares: "Wives are ordered to be subject and to revere their husbands: and husbands are admonished so to love their wives, that they may lay down their lives for them, and for the sake of love being concerned for their feelings and training that they may be religious and holy."[29] In support of this teaching we have also the view of St. Basil the Great, who states: "That men should love their wives with the love with which Christ loved the Church, and delivered himself up for her that he might sanctify her."[30] The remaining Fathers who comment upon this teaching simply insist upon the words of St. Paul. Therefore, instead of restating their testimony we will consider it sufficient to mention their names, at the same time pointing out where their testimony may be found. These names include Origen,[31] Clement of Alex-

[31] St. Ambrose, *Comm, in Ep. ad Ephes,* c. V, v. 25-28; P.L., Migne, t. 17, 398: "Mulieres esse jubentur subditae et reverentiam habere virorum: viri vero ita diligere mulieres suas admonentur: ut etiam animas suas pro illis ponant, causa dilectionis zelum habentes circa affectum earum et disciplinam ut religiosae et sanctae sint."

[29] St. Basil the Great, *Moralia,* Regula 73, c. 2, P.G., Migne, t. 31, 851.

[30] Origen, *In Canticum Canticorum,* Homilia II, 1, P.G., Migne, 13, 47.

andria,[82] and finally St. John Chrysostom.[83] To sum up the teaching of the Fathers, we can do no better than to repeat the words of Father Sirvaitis in this regard.

> If the Fathers require that the wife be obedient, humble, simple and kind, no less do they obligate the husband to be a wise governor and teacher, to care for the spiritual and material good of the family, not to repress her with threats or blows but to perfect her by example and counsel. They also require the wife to be pious and to be ornate with virtues, and admonish the husband to lead the wife by the performance of good works.[84]

Turning to the ecclesiastical *Magisterium,* we find that its teaching is clearly summed up in the encyclical of Pope Pius XI. Here, very emphatically and very clearly, he declares:

> This conjugal faith, however, which is most aptly called by St. Augustine the "faith of chastity" blooms more freely, more beautifully, and more nobly, when it is rooted in that more excellent soil, the love of husband and wife which pervades all the duties of married life and holds pride of place in Christian marriage. For matrimonial faith demands that husband and wife be joined in an especially pure and holy love, not as adulterers love each other, but as Christ loved the Church. This precept the Apostle laid down when he said: "Husbands, love your wives just as Christ also loved the Church," that Church which of a truth He embraced with a boundless love not for the sake of His own advantage, but seeking only the

[82] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromatum,* Liber IV, c. 8, P.G., Migne, 8, 1275.

[83] St. John Chrysostom, *In Epist. Ad Ephesios,* c. V, Homilia XX, P.G., Migne, 62, 136-37.

[84] Sirvaitis, Casimiro, C.SC.P., *Casti Connubii Monita de luribus et Officiis* (The Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology, n. 80, Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1943), p. 59: "Si Patres requirunt ut uxor obedîens, humilis, simplex, benigna sit, non minus virum obligant ut sit optimus gubernator et magister, curet bonum spirituale et materiale familiae, uxorem non reprimat minis vel verberibus sed exemplis et consiliis eam perficiat. . . . Uti requirunt ut uxor sit pia et virtutibus ornata, ita et maritum admonent ut uxori viam indicet in operibus bonis patrandis."

> good of His Spouse. The love, then, of which We are speaking is not that based on the passing lust of the moment nor does it consist in pleasing words only, but in the deep attachment of the heart which is expressed in action,, since love is proved by deeds. This outward expression of love in the home demands not only mutual help but must go further; must have as its primary purpose that man and wife help each other in forming and perfecting themselves in the interior life, so that through their partnership in life they may advance ever more and more in virtue, and above all that they may grow in true love towards God and their neighbor, on which indeed "dependeth the whole Law and the Prophets."[35]

The Holy Father thus pointed out the mutual formation and perfection of the spouses as the object of their love. He does this after citing the precept laid down by St. Paul in his Epistle. Obviously, then, he is interpreting this passage for all Christians, but especially for Christian spouses for whom he selects a particular lesson to be learned, i.e., the special direction which their love for one another should take. This opinion is confirmed by Vermeersch in his commentary on the encyclical wherein he declares: 'Tn the first place and holding the preeminence of nobility, (conjugal faith) demands a true, mutual love of charity, not based on a carnal nor fleeting fancy, not satisfied with words, but active, and that not

[35] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 548 f.: Postulat praeterea matrimonii fides ut vir et uxor singulari quodam sanctoque ac puro amore coniuncti sint; neque ut adulteri inter se ament, sed ut Christus dilexit Ecclesiam; hanc enim regulam Apostolus praescripsit, cum ait: Viri diligite uxores vestras sicut et Christus dilexit Ecclesiam; quam certe immensa illa caritate, non sui commodi gratia, sed Sponsae tantum utilitatem sibi proponens, complexus est. Caritatem igitur dicimus, non carnali tantum citiusque evanescente inclinatione innixam, neque in blandis solum verbis, sed etiam in intimo animi affectu positam atque, siquidem probatio dilectionis exhibitio est operis, opere externo comprobatam. Hoc autem opus in domestica societate non modo mutuum auxilium complectitur, verum etiam ad hoc extendatur oportet, immo hoc in primis intendat, ut coniuges inter se iuventur ad interiorem hominem plenius in dies conformandum perficiendumque; ita ut per se mutuam vitae consortionem in virtutibus magis magisque in dies proficiant, et praecipue in vera erga Deum proximosque caritate crescant, in qua denique universa Lex pendet et Prophetae." *(PPt,* pp. 7-8.)

only through mutual aid in present cares, but also through a mutual zeal for spiritual progress."[38] Father Sirvaitis expresses much the same view: "This conjugal love . . . not only is directed to mutual aid, but also more profoundly and even primarily to forming and perfecting themselves in the interior life, in other words to a new man perfect in virtue. It is possible for the spouses . . . to arrive at the summit of Christian perfection."[37] After one reads commentaries such as these, there can be no doubt how the words of the Holy Father were understood. They take upon themselves added force by the very fact that they come from him, the Supreme Shepherd and Teacher of the Church. Apropos of this Sirvaitis remarks; "Consequently, although the encyclical letter, '*Casti Connubii*' is not infallible, it carries great authority, and its teaching must be accepted by all the faithful."[38] With the weight of such an authority supporting our view, we will proceed now to an examination of the teaching of the theologians on this subject.

The theologians follow a twofold approach in attacking this problem. First, there are those who approach it from the general point of view. They speak of the general concept of mutual help, and point out its object. Secondly, there are those who treat the question directly. They speak explicitly of the specific notion—conjugal love—and then ascribe its object. Following the method of the first group is Vermeersch who states very clearly and unmistakably that it is the purpose of mutual help to be ordained to man's final end. These are his words; "Mutual help should be

[36]A. Vermeersch, S.J., "Enc. 'Casti Connubii' Annotationes," p. 47: "In primis et tamquam principatum nobilitatis tenens, (fides conjugalis), postulat, veram, mutuam dilectionem caritatis, non carnali et fugaci inclinatione innixam, non verbis contentam, sed operosam, idque non tantum per mutuum auxilium in praesentibus, sed etiam per mutuum studium profectus spiritualis.

[37] Sirvaitis, *op. cit.,* p. 38: "Hic amor conjugalis . . . non solum ad mutuum auxilium dirigitur, sed profundius et etiam primario ad 'interiorem hominem plenius in dies conformandum perficiendumque,' aliis verbis ad novum hominem in virtutibus perfectum. Coniugibus possibile est . . . ad summum perfectionis christianae pervenire."

[38] *Ibid.,* p. 4: "Consequenter, etsi Litterae Encyclicae 'Casti Connubii' infallibiles non sunt, magnam tamen auctoritatem prae se ferunt et earum doctrina a fidelibus obedienter acceptanda est."

directed immediately to man's final end. It contains, therefore, the zeal of the spouses for forming and perfecting themselves in relation to eternal life."[30] This was the same notion which he had previously expressed in his Catechism based on the encyclical on Christian Marriage of Pope Pius XI ;[39] because of this we can be sure that he had no doubts in his mind on this matter. Payen reaches the same conclusion ; it is notable that he uses the words "mutual sanctification" to express the object which the spouses are striving to attain in their life together. Thus he declares : "The secondary end is mutual help not only in domestic affairs, but especially in educating the offspring humanly and religiously, and in fostering mutual sanctification."[41] The second group of theologians, those who discuss the specific concept, conjugal love, are very definite and precise in expressing their opinions. Foremost among these is Zeiger. In his definition of Christion conjugal love he says that through their love the spouses aid each other in the way of perfection, in the fervor of the charity of God, by an apostolate proper to the marital state. His conception is that love is a mission or an apostolate by which the spouses aid one another in the attainment of God. His words are such an embodiment of all that we wish to express in Christian conjugal love that it is only proper that we quote them in full.

> Amongst Christians, therefore, as long as they are truly Christians, the sexual instinct and ethical love are sublimated and elevated through the sacramental graces of matrimony ; each spouse joined to God adheres to the other, cherishes him as a most dear child of God, a companion in grace and a co-heir in glory. In this union of souls not only the spiritual goods of the natural order are communicated, but in as much as possible the supernatural

[39] Vermeersch, *Theologia Moralis,* IV, p. *32* : "Illud mutuum adiutorium ad finem hominis supremum profecto referri debet. Continet igitur studium coniugum se mutuo conformandi et perficiendi in ordine ad vitam aeternam."

[40] Vermeersch, *What Is Marriage?* p. 32.

[41] Payen, G., SJ-, *De Matrimonio,* I, p. 62: "Prior finis secundarius est 'mutuum adjutorium' non solum in curandis domesticis negotiis, sed maxime in prole humanitus et religiose educanda, necnon in mutua sanctificatione fovenda."

> goods, by which one aids the other in the way of perfection, in the fervor of the charity of God, in an apostolate proper to the marital state.[42]

Lonergan in his commentary on the words of Pope Pius XI is no less explicit when he declares: "If I have paraphrased this passage fairly, I think there can be no doubt that the encyclical is speaking of a process of development through conjugal love to the very summit of Christian perfection."[43] These views, in turn, are confirmed by the words of Merkelbach,[44] and also those of Von Hildebrand. The latter declares:

> Conjugal love, like every authentic love, implies a genuine intention to make the beloved happy. He who loves is even more anxious for the happiness of the beloved than for his own. . . . But in the supernaturally transfigured conjugal love, this intention is elevated to a fervent desire for the *eternal welfare* of the beloved. The eternal welfare of the beloved is not only desired in the same way as the salvation of our neighbor in general, but with the particular consciousness that this is the person destined for me whose salvation concerns me in a particular way and above all others.[45]

Moreover, we have a confirmatory argument from those theologians who counsel the spouses to love one another with supernatural love. For example, Scheeben tells us: "it follows from the nature of*

[42] Ivo Zeiger, S.J., "Nova Definitio Matrimonii," p. 44*: "Inter Christianos vero, dummodo sint Christiani veri nominis, per gratias sacramentales matrimonii tendentia instinctus sexualis et amoris ethici sublimatur ac elevatur tendentia illa supernatural!; qua uterque coniux Deo coniunctus alteri coniugi adhaeret, eum fovet ut filium Dei carissimum, socium in gratia, coheredem in gloria; in hac unione animorum non solum bona spiritualia ordinis naturalis communicantur, sed in quantum possibile bona supernaturalia, quatenus imus alterum adiuvat in via perfectionis, in fervore caritatis Dei, in apostolatu statui maritali proprio."

[43] Bernard J. Lonergan, S.J., "Finality, Love, Marriage," ThS, 4 (1943), p. 487.

[44] Merkelbach, *op. cit.*, pp. 977-78.

[45] Von Hildebrand, Dietrich, *Marriage* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1942), pp. 37-38.

Christian marriage that the husband and wife must love each other not merely with natural love, but with supernatural love, as members of Christ and as representatives of His mystical nuptials with the Church."[48] We also have De Smet who makes his own the words of St. Francis De Sales: "amongst Christians love should be holy and supernatural."[44] In summation we may state that the theologians present us a picture of utmost clarity in regard to the particular object of conjugal love. Without doubt or hesitation of any kind they declare it is the "mutual sanctification" of the spouses.

Our concluding argument is taken from reason. Reason tells us that real mutual love will impel one to seek the greatest good and greatest happiness for his partner. Since we are speaking of Christian conjugal love, no spouse, prompted by this love, could wish a greater good or greater happiness for his partner than his sanctification. The desire that one's spouse should be joined eternally to his ultimate end, his ultimate joy and happiness, God Himself—for this is what sanctification means in the final analysis —certainly constitutes an expression of love. Indeed, in this life it is man's greatest expression of love. Morrisqn declares that "to love, as understood by the scholastic philosopher, is first to discover what is another's good and then to set about helping that other to acquire this good."[48] In this case the good is known—eternal life. To help one's partner to attain that good is to love that person. Moreover, since this is the greatest good that one can offer, to help him or her to attain that is to exhibit the greatest love. Thus, even though one of himself could not grant this gift, yet, in the hope that the spouse will attain it, and the help that one puts forth in bringing that desire to its realization, Christian conjugal love is manifested to its fullest extent. To bring this about, it must not be forgotten that each spouse should strive diligently to attain this end in his own life. This is necessary because of the

[44] Scheeben, *op. cit.,* p, 605.

"De Smet, Al., *Tractatus Theologico-Canonicus De Sponsalibus Et Matrimonio,* p. 232.

[48] "Morrison, Bakewell, S.J., *God Is Its Founder* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1946), p. 3.

mutual influence that each exerts upon the other, because of the closeness and intimacy of the life they must lead, and finally and most important, because the sanctity achieved in the life of one spouse will depend to a great extent upon the sanctity achieved in the life of the other. This is to say that if one has led a holy life, he has already to a certain extent brought sanctity to the other. In the words of a member of the Canadian hierarchy:

> It's hard to imagine a man in Heaven whose wife is in Hell, or vice versa. No, it doesn't usually happen that way: if it does happen, that's the exception to the general rule. Either both of you will find your eternal resting-place in Heaven, or both of you will be consigned to the fires that refuse to be quenched.[49]

Thus we see that Christian conjugal love aims naturally at the "mutual sanctification" of the spouses, in as much as this is the greatest gift or the greatest good that the spouses can desire for one another. Such an expression of love retains its force only if this desire for sanctification of one's partner is accompanied by a similar desire of one's own sanctity.

In summarizing our view on the object of Christian conjugal love, we can say definitely that it is the teaching of Our Divine Saviour as given first through St. Paul. Although most exegetes would have us believe, and rightly so, that the main purpose of the passage in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians is to furnish evidence for the sacramentality of Matrimony, still in its literal signification it has a meaning of its own. It not only points out the model for the mutual love of the spouses, but also gives to that love its purpose. In so far as the Fathers are concerned, we may note that, although they continue the Pauline teaching, they add nothing substantial to it. It remained for His Holiness, Pope Pius XI, after a considerable lapse of time, to amplify the Pauline teaching. He gave it a new force, new vigor; and finally gave to it its present precise signification. Lastly, it is in the modern theologians that we find the clarity that now at-

[49] *Marriage-Preparation Course* (The Catholic Centre, Ottawa: University of Ottawa, 1946), p. 21.

taches itself to this teaching. Over all of this, reason tells us that "mutual sanctification" is a most appropriate expression of the love that should be in evidence between the spouses.

We have already defined natural conjugal love as the virtue which effects a union of husband and wife by which they wish to give each other the marital benefits.[110] In Christian marriage this love ceases to be purely natural and becomes an aspect of theological charity.[51] Through the Sacrament of Matrimony man's natural love is immeasurably strengthened; indeed, it is elevated to far beyond its natural capacity. Human love becomes an instrument whereby Divine Love is attained. The principle of operation is no longer the natural powers alone, but these powers aided by grace. This is the teaching of the Council of Trent, which in its twenty-fourth session declared: "Christ Himself, the institutor and perfector of the venerable sacraments, merited by his Passion on our behalf the grace which should perfect the natural love of marriage, render the union indissoluble, and sanctify the married pair."[52] In explaining this Merkelbach states that the effect of this grace is to unite the souls of the spouses.[53] Undoubtedly what he means is that the union of souls, in which conjugal love essentially consists, is now more intense and profound. The union is deepened and strengthened by the outpouring of grace. Joyce, in speaking of the consequences were this love not so consecrated, says:

> Indeed, were not this supernatural gift bestowed on Christian partners, St. Paul's exhortations to them would be out of place. He bids the husband cherish his wife with love similar to that which Christ bears to the Church, The demand would be impossible of fulfillment if marriage did not carry with it an endowment for this end. Love such as this is out of the reach of man's natural faculties. It supposes that elevation of our faculties and of their acts which grace alone can confer.[54]

[110] *Supra,* p. 37.

[51] Mersch, Emile, S.J., *Morality and the Mystical Body,* p. 220.

[52] *Supra,* p. 30.

[53] Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 780: "Effectus supernaturalis matrimonii est gratia animorum unitiva. . ."

[54] Joyce, *op. cit.,* p, 154.

Hence, the natural love of the man and woman is elevated by grace. Furthermore, the spouses must look upon each other with something more than a general interest Besides being a dearly beloved spouse, each should be to the other a most beloved son of God, a companion in grace, and a co-heir to eternal glory.[65] And the marital benefits which we said could be reduced to the *tria bona* of which St. Augustine speaks,[06] undergo a change. In reference to these we can speak especially of the *bonum sacramenti* which reaches its full perfection only in Christian marriage.[6'] However, even the other *bona,* the *bonum prolis* and the *bonum fidei, experience a certain transformation. Joyce* declares:

> The blessing of children is for the faithful a far different thing from what it is for those outside, since Christian children are born that they may be nurtured as children of God. So too, within the Church, the mutual fidelity of man and wife is not motived by self-interest, but has in view the spiritual good and the eternal reward of the other partner also.[5887]

" *Supra,* p. 99.

'' St. Augustine, *De Bono Coniugali,* cap. 24, n. 32.

[87] Cf. Vermeersch, *What Is Marriage?* pp. 26-27, wherein he speaks of this full perfection as the absolute indissolubility of Christian Marriage. Thus he explains : "The ultimate reason for this inflexibility may be found in the mystical signification of Christian marriage. According to St. Paul (Eph. 5:32), marriage between Christians reproduces the perfect union which exists forever between Christ and His Church. Now this reproduction is achieved in its perfection in marriage between baptized persons, which has been consummated. Common sense teaches us that by the use of the conjugal right marriage receives a sort of completion; something irreparable has taken place; the affective and verbal self-surrender has been supplemented by an actual physical one which justifies the expression, very significant in itself, of 'consummated marriage.' It is consummated, we may say, in the physical order, and it is also consummated in the symbolical and mystical order, in which it represents the indefectible union between Christ and His Church. In a perfect representation of this union, the indefectibility of the union must have its own symbol ; and it has in it the absolutely indissoluble marriage."—Cf. also: Farrell, Walter, O.P., *A Companion to the Summa,* IV, pp. 410-11.

''Joyce, *op. cit.,* p. 149.

Finally, in accord with the clue given us in this last sentence, we see that the end or purpose of this love too must be elevated. This is the attainment of God as He is in Himself. This is the object of Christian conjugal love, and the means whereby God is attained in this way, is that process which we have described as "mutual sanctification." Thus the whole of conjugal love is affected by grace ; not one part remains that is not transformed. In summary form, then, we can say with Zeiger that:

> Supernaturally elevated, conjugal love is that love in which the spouses, united by the Sacrament and aided by the sacramental grace, by common effort and zeal are informed, both themselves and their children, with heavenly virtues, tend to a supernatural end, and so in a more perfect manner than is otherwise possible, represent that most chaste and most holy love, with which Christ embraces the Church.[88]

We now turn to our view of sanctification as the object of conjugal love and consider it in its relationship to the general and primary purpose of marriage. It is our belief that no real intrinsic relation exists between them. At most the relationship is purely accidental and extrinsic. Speaking of marriage as an institution, we say that the Sacrament of Matrimony adds nothing substantial to the primary purpose of marriage. That which was the primary purpose of marriage considered as a natural institution—the procreation and education of children—remains the primary purpose of Christian marriage. As stated by the Code of Canon Law : "The primary end of marriage is the procreation and education of children."[60] The only thing that Christian marriage may be said to add is this. It looks not to the procreation of children as such but to the procreation of children who are destined to be the children

[88] Zeiger, *op. cit.,* p. 48* : "Cui in connubio christiano accedere debet amor sensu plenissimo sumptus, sci., supernaturaliter elevatus, quo coniuges Sacramento coniuncti, gratia sacramentali adiuti, conatu communi atque studio et ipsi et filii virtutibus coelestibus informentur, tendant ad finem supernaturalem, et sic perfectiori quo fieri potest modo repraesentent amorem illum castissimum atque sanctissimum, quo Christus Ecclesiam amplectitur."

[60] *" Codex luris Canonici,* No. 1013, 1.

of God. Pope Leo XIII makes us aware of this fact when he declares:

> For, first, there has been vouchsafed to the marriage union a higher and nobler purpose than was ever previously given to it. By the command of Christ, it not only looks to the propagation of the human race, but to the bringing forth of children for the Church, *fellow-citizens with the saints, and the domestics of God;* (Eph. 2:19) so that *a people might be born and brought up for the worship and religion of the true God and our Saviour Jesus Christ*[1]

Besides this, Christian marriage might be said to create a better atmosphere wherein the ends and purposes and aims of marriage might be more securely and more surely attained. Our meaning will become clearer when we say that this is but to indicate the difference that exists between marriage with and without grace. These ends could have been attained in a non-sacramental union: they are more certainly and more securely attained in a sacramental marriage. This results because of the principle that grace perfects nature.[82] Speaking of the graces of the Sacrament of Matrimony, Pope Pius XI states: "By these gifts the parties are assisted not only in understanding, but in knowing intimately, *in* adhering to firmly, in willing effectively, and in successfully putting into practice, those things which pertain to the marriage state, its aims and duties. . ."[63] In the same manner we can speak of conjugal love. It is the purpose of the spouses to aid each other[68]

[1] Pope Leo XIII, *op. cit.,* 389 f.: "Nam primo quidem nuptiali societati excelsius quiddam et nobilius propositum est, quam antea fuisset; ea enim spectare iussa est non modo ad propagandum genus humanum, sed ad ingenerandam Ecclesiae sobolem, *cives Sanctorum et domesticos Dei; ut nimirum populus ad veri Dei et Salvatoris nostri Christi cultum et religionem procrearetur atque educaretur"* (PPt, pp. 8-9.)

[82] *Supra,* p. 30.

[63] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 554 f.: "(Hoc enim Sacramentum . , . peculiaria addit dona, bonos animi motus, gratiae germina, naturae vires augendo ac perficiendo) ut *carriages* non ratione tantum intelligere, sed intime sapere firmiterque tenere, efficaciter velle et opere perficere valeant quidquid ad statum coniugalem eiusque fines et officia pertinet. . ." (PPt, p. 13.)

in the attainment of holiness, in which state, if they persist, they will arrive at eternal glory. We proposed that one of the best ways in which the spouses could aid each other in the achievement of this goal, was to help in the gaining of those actual graces to which they are entitled through the Sacrament. If we consider that these actual graces are aimed by their very nature at the fulfillment of the conjugal duties,[64] we must realize that these will be aimed especially at the attainment of the primary end of marriage. Certainly, then, with God's help in the form of these graces, the spouses will more surely achieve the purposes set forth by God for marriage, than if they attempted to attain these without divine aid. We thus maintain that in Christian marriage the secondary ends retain their strict subordination to the primary end. Under no account can they be considered as having assumed the role of the primary purpose of marriage in the strict meaning of that term. However, with the addition of grace the secondary ends will be immeasurably strengthened, and will make easier the attainment of the primary end.

As for the statement of the Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, that:

> This mutual inward moulding of husband and wife, this determined effort to perfect each other, can in a very real sense, as the Roman Catechism teaches, be said to be the chief reason and purpose of matrimony, provided matrimony be looked at not in the restricted sense as instituted for the proper conception and education of the child, but more widely as the blending of life as a whole and the mutual interchange and sharing thereof.[6]

We believe that the Holy Father makes very clear the meaning which he wished attached to his words. He says this is not to be understood in the restricted sense in which the procreation and

M Merkelbach, *op. cit,.* III, p. 781.

w Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 548 f.: "Haec mutua coniugum interior conformatio, hoc assiduum sese invicem perficiendi studium, verissima quadam ratione, ut docet Catechismus Romanus, etiam primaria matrimonii causa et ratio dici potest, si tamen matrimonium non pressius ut institutum ad prolem rite procreandam educandamque, sed latius ut totius vitae communio, consuetudo, societas accipiatur." (PPt, p. 8.)

education of children is looked upon as the primary purpose of marriage, but in a wider sense wherein marriage is considered as the total community of life. Viewed in this light, sanctification of the spouses is called the primary purpose of marriage in an imperfect sense only. Any indication that might seem to point to a different interpretation is forestalled by the Holy Father who had already prefaced his remarks with the statement: "this is also expressed succinctly in the Code of Canon Law—'The primary end of marriage is the procreation and education of children.' "[60]*We, therefore, must state that sanctification is not to be called the primary purpose of marriage in the strict sense of that term. As Merkelbach states: "Neither mutual love nor mutual perfection is the primary end . . ."[67] and as he continues, he explains the statement of the Roman Catechism to which the Holy Father had alluded:

> Thence (this mutual interior formation of the spouses) is called not the primary end of the institution of marriage nor the "*finis operis*/' but the cause; not simply but by a certain *ratio,* namely a primary cause impelling or a principle moving the agent, and a *ratio* from which the principal excellence and the whole perfection of matrimony is derived; and this only if marriage is not taken in the restricted sense as the institution for rightly procreating and generating offspring, or as the primary end, but in the wider sense as a total community of life, i.e., precisely as a secondary end.[68]

" *Ibid.,* 546 f.: "quod quidem ipsum in Codice iuris canonici quoque nervose edicitur: 'Matrimonii finis primarius est procreatio atque educatio prolis.' " (PPt, p. 6.)

m Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 758: "Nec mutuus amor et mutua perfectio est finis primarius. . ."

* *Ibid.·.* "Proinde (haec mutua coniugum interior conformatio) non finis primarius institutionis matrimonii dicitur nec finis operis, sed causa; non simpliciter sed *quadam ratione,* scii, primaria *causa impellens* seu principium movens operantem, et *ratio* ex qua praecipua excellentia et tota perfectio matrimonii derivatur; et solum, si id non sumatur pressius ut institutum ad prolem rite procreandam et educandam, seu quantum ad finem primarium, sed latius ut totius vitae communio, i.e., praecise quantum ad finem secundarium."

Merkelbach thus confirms the fact that the Holy Father was speaking of marriage in a wide sense when he stated that the mutual formation of the spouses could be said to be the chief reason and purpose of matrimony. Vermeersch also supports this view. In answering the question, "Why does the Encyclical designate the mutual formation of the spouses ... as one of the primary causes and reasons for marriage?" he states: "because the community of life between the spouses—our second definition of marriage—is providentially directed by God to this last end, which, being the supreme end of man, occupies the first place in the Divine Will."[68] Thus, he too distinguishes by stating that he is considering marriage in its second definition. Furthermore, as Ford remarks, "the Encyclical is speaking of the supernatural perfection of the partners, and it is not likely that this perfection would be set up as the primary purpose of marriage looked at as an institution of nature. And when we speak of the primary and secondary ends of marriage we mean ends which it has from the natural law."[70] Finally, we have the confirmation of Aertnys-Damen. They declare: "This union, this conjugal love, inasmuch as it is to be nourished according to the intention of nature, is an end but not the ultimate end of matrimony: it is an end *"sui generis"* which according to the intention of nature bespeaks a relationship to all the other ends."[71] If conjugal love is not the ultimate end of matrimony, then the sanctification of the spouses cannot be the ultimate end, since it is only the object of this love.

Moreover, if we consider the statement of the Holy Father from another point of view, it would seem that he is referring to the *finis operantis* of the parties in his statement, rather than *finis operis.* If we return once more to Merkelbach's quotation, we will see this to be his opinion. He states: "(this mutual interior formation of the spouses) is called not the primary end of

[68] Vermeersch, *What Is Marriage?* p. 25.

[70] John C. Ford, S.J., "Marriage: Its Meaning and Purposes," p. 372.

[71] J. Aertnys, C.SS.R,, and C. A. Damen, C.SS.R., *Theologia Moralis,* II, p. 470: "Haec unio, hic amor conjugalis quatenus ex naturae intentione fovendus est, etiam finis sed non ultimus matrimonii est: sed est finis quidam sui generis qui ex intentione naturae ad omnes alios fines ordinem dicit."

the institution of marriage nor the *"finis operis,"* but the cause; not simply but by a certain *ratio,* namely a primary cause impelling or a principle moving the agent. . .'*72 Ford's testimony on this point is very conclusive; and the fact that his study is one of the best that we have on this subject gives added weight to his views. He declares:

> It seems more likely that this passage of the Encyclical refers to the motives of the contracting parties rather than to an end to which marriage is objectively and essentially related. This is the interpretation given to it by Father Franz Hürth, whose opinion has peculiar weight. And the *Roman* Catechism strengthens this view; for in the section of it cited by the Encyclical we find that the ends of marriage are treated, not merely as the objective *fines operis* of the institution, but also as the subjective motives or purposes for which the partners should marry.ra

Father Connell voices the same opinion in regard to the Roman Catechism. In his reference to it he states: "It would seem from the context that in designating the society of the other sex and the hope of mutual aid as the first reason for marriage the Catechism has reference to the subjective inclinations of the contracting parties, their *finis operantis*After considering all these points, we seem warranted in concluding that the Holy Father had reference only to the intentions of the spouses, in other words the *finis operantis.* We are thus furnished an additional reason for viewing the mutual formation of the spouses as the primary purpose of marriage in an imperfect sense only.

It seems to us that when Dr. Dorns alludes to Pius Xi's reference to the Roman Catechism, he draws a conclusion which js not sufficiently warranted by the facts in hand. For example, he says:

n Supra, p. 108.

"Ford, *op. cit.,* p. 372; cf. also John C. Ford, S.J., "Current Theology," ThS, 5 (1944), pp. 495-538.

" Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., "The Catholic Doctrine on the Ends of Marriage," *Proceedings of the Foundation Meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America,* New York City, June 25, 26, 1946, p. 39.

"love and community of life have always been recognized as a true purpose'of marriage, if not the first purpose. The Encyclical is important because it provides a timely recognition that we are not unjustified in looking at marriage from a point of view different from that of St. Thomas."[78] With this as a starting point he proceeds to develop his work. What he arrives at may be judged by the following example:

> The constitution of marriage, the union of two persons, does not then consist in their subservience to a purpose outside themselves, for which they marry. It consists in the constant vital ordination of husband and wife to each other until they become one. If this is so, there can no longer be sufficient reason, from this standpoint, for speaking of procreation as the primary purpose (in the sense in which St. Thomas used the phrase) and for dividing off the other purposes as secondary.[79]

We do not believe this to be a lawful procedure. For in effect this is to make another and different primary purpose of marriage. And as we have already shown, it was just such an interpretation that the Holy Father wished to forestall. Moreover, the Holy Office warned against such who designated a different primary end or purpose of marriage. It declared:

> In these writings another primary end of marriage is designated by them, for example, the complementing and personal perfection of the spouses through a complete community of life and action; the mutual love of the spouses and the union to be nourished and perfected through the psychic and somatic surrender of their persons. . . In these writings occasionally a meaning is given to words appearing in documents of the Church (e.g., *end, primary, secondary}* which does not agree with these words according to their common usage among theologians.[77]&

[78] Dorns, Dr. Herbert, *The Meaning* of *Marriage,* pp. xxi-xjdi.

[79] *Ibid.,* p. 87.

[77] Congregatio S. Officii, AAS, 36 (1944), 103 f.: "Hisce in elucubrationibus primarius coniugit finis alius ab aliis designatur, ut ex. gr.: coniugum per omnimodam vitae actionisque communionem complementum ac personalis per- &

Furthermore, Dorns does not distinguish between *finis operis* and *finis operantis.* For example, as proof of his statement that "love and community of life have always been recognized as a true purpose of marriage, if not the first purpose/ he adduces such statements as the following, which in reality are nothing more than the subjective motives of the parties concerned. Thus he declares: "Rather each wants first the other person in his full dignity, and then fulfillment through complete community of life"[78] or again: "Experience teaches, and those philosophers and theologians who trouble to listen to her confirm, that love is generally a stronger motive for marriage than desire for children."[79] In other words it would seem that those things which the spouses themselves are seeking in marriage *{fines operantis}* are the basis upon which he sets out to discover the purposes of marriage considered as an institution *(finis operis).* Therefore, he wrests a conclusion which the facts do not justify. To return to the point of the discussion, we feel sure that even though the spouses may make "mutual sanctification" their primary motive for marriage, in no way can this be viewed as the primary purpose of marriage, considered as the institution. Such a primary motive may promote a better attainment of the primary purpose, but at the same time as love's object it will retain love's subordination to this primary purpose or end.

fectio; coniugum mutuus amor atque unio fovenda ac perficienda per psychicam et somaticam propriae personae traditionem. . . In iisdem scriptis interdum, verbis in documentis Ecclesiae occurentibus (uti sunt v. gr. *finis, primarius, secundarius)* sensus tribuitur qui cum his vocibus, secundum communem theologorum usum, non congruit."

78 Dorns, *of. cit,, p.* 4.

79 */bid.,* pp. 25-26.

CHAPTER IV

Conjugal Love: Some Practical Considerations

In this our final chapter, it is our intention to propose several practical considerations which are in order after an examination into the nature of conjugal love. Naturally, conjugal love will have its effects on the daily lives of the husband and wife. We have already discussed in general the importance and necessity of conjugal love; now it remains to discuss conjugal love as it relates to particular problems. First, we shall discuss cohabitation, which has a close connection and relationship with this love. After that discussion has been completed, we will turn to a discussion of several evils which aim at the destruction of conjugal love, or which makes its attainment or maintenance difficult.

ARTICLE I. COHABITATION

It is of the nature of the man and woman to be inclined towards a community of life with each other. Joyce declares:

> The interests alike of man and woman call for association with the other. The two sexes are complementary. This is signally manifest as regards life's material side, their spheres of work are distinct. , . . Neither can do without the service of the other. Nor is this less true in the moral sphere. The intellectual and emotional qualities of the sexes are widely different. The rational element is strongest in man; the affections in woman. Each finds what is wanting to self supplied by the other. Only where there is the closest moral union and the fullest reciprocal service does human nature find its true realization.[1]

De Smet in speaking of this natural inclination of the sexes is even more specific in his notions. He would say that not only does the nature of man and woman incline them to a certain community

[1]Joyce, George H., S.J., *Christian Marriage; An Historical and Doctrinal Study,* p. 16.

of life, but even more pointedly to a life of cohabitation.[2] This may be defined as a communion of habitation, the dwelling of both spouses in the same home.[3] This, in turn, ordinarily implies three things, the *consortium tori, mensae et tecti* This means that the spouses are bound *per se* to live together in the same home, taking their meals together, while also occupying the same bed-chamber. Of course, in practice, this works out to a much' more complete association of life. It is so complete, in fact, that the spouses are almost always together, allowance being made for the time spent by each *in the* pursuance of their separate labors. However, such a complete association must be expected if the spouses are to attain the ends for which marriage was instituted.

Although we may say that nature itself inclines the sexes towards cohabitation, as far as the essence of marriage is concerned, cohabitation is not essential.[5] It does, however, look to the integrity and perfection of marriage. It pertains especially to the three ends of marriage, inasmuch as without it these ends ordinarily cannot be attained.[6] Merkelbach declares that "cohabitation or an association in a common life is an obligation to which the spouses are bound *per se* out of justice. Without this it is morally impossible to fulfill the duties consonant with an undivided mode of life, of which it is an integral part.[7] Furthermore, he continues:

[2] De Smet, Al., *Tractatus Theologico-Canonicus De Sponsalibus et Matrimonio,* p. 221: "Hanc etiam cohabitationem suadet nativa quae ad illam habetur inclinatio inter virum et mulierem, necnon mutua indigentia unius respectu alterius in ordinanda vita domestica."

[3] Payen, G., S.J., *De Matrimonio,* II, p. 794.

[4] Merkelbach, B., O.P., Summa *Theologiae Moralis,* III, p. 968: "(Cohabitatio) Complectitur de se consortium tori, mensae et tecti."

[5] Gasparri, P., *Tractatus Canonicus De Matrimonio,* II, p. 189: "Ceterum ius ad hanc vitae communionem pertinere ad integritatem potius quam ad essentiam matrimonii alias diximus. .."

[6] Payen, *op. cit.,* II, p, 794: "Sed ad ejus *integritatem* et *perfectionem,* spectat; nam sine ea conjuges regulariter nequeunt *tres matrimonii fines,* ut oportet, consequi."

[7] Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 968: "Cohabitatio seu vitae communis consortium est altera obligatio ad quam *coniuges per se tenentur ex iustitia,* et sine qua moraliter impossibile est officia implere pertinentia ad individuam vitae consuetudinem, cuius proinde est pars integralis."

"The spouses should preserve this association of conjugal life, unless a just cause excuses them. This is shown from the nature of matrimony, and from the ends of marriage which demand an undivided and an inseparable community of life."[8]*fn regard to the ends of marriage, we may speak especially of the relationship between cohabitation and conjugal love. To a certain extent we have already indicated this relationship when we spoke of the importance and necessity of conjugal love in the lives of the spouses.[8] For example, Pope Pius XI implies this point when he says that "the house built upon a rock, that is *to* say on mutual conjugal chastity and strengthened by a deliberate and constant union of spirit, will not only never fall away but will never be shaken by adversity."[10] More important, however, in indicating this relationship are the words of Merkelbach, who explains that this association of a common life is precisely the secondary end of matrimony. He states : "Amongst the Scholastics, as we see, the object and end of marriage is called the undivided inode of life, which essentially consists in the mutual right and duty towards their bodies in relation to the conjugal act; integrally, however, it also contains a common bed, table and cohabitation."[11] And though he speaks of the general term, secondary end, he cannot but include in this principally the notion of conjugal love. Payen makes this very clear when he speaks of conjugal love as the bond of cohabitation.[12] Vermeersch also does this when in a very practical manner he relates conjugal love to cohabitation. He

[8] Zâvi.,TP· 968-69 : "Coniuges servare debent vitae coniugalis communionem, nisi iusta causa eos excuset. Constat ex ipsa coniugii natura, et ex finibus matrimonii qui exigunt individuum et inseparabilem convictum."

[8] *Supra,* pp. 65-68.

[10] Pope Pius XI, *"Casti Connubii,"* 569 f. : At contra, quae supra petram constituta fuerit domus, mutua nempe inter coniuges caritate, et deliberata ac constanti animorum coniunctione solidata, nulla concutietur adversitate, nedum evertetur." (PPt, p. 24.)

[11] Merkelbach, o/>. *cit.,* III, p. 734: "Apud Scholasticos, ut vidimus, obiectum et finis matrimonii dicitur individua vitae consuetudo, quae essentialiter consistit in iure et officio mutuo quoad corpora in ordine ad actum coniugalem, integraliter autem continet etiam commune torum, mensam et cohabitationem."

[12] Payen,*4>p. cit.,* II. p. 794.

remarks: "A common bedroom as well as a common roof are to be highly recommended to the spouses. For separate bedrooms, inasmuch as they furnish a ready occasion for sins and suspicions, are shown to be very harmful to mutual love, and, as experience witnesses, are a frequent cause of unhappy marriages and divorces."[13] Conjugal love thus reaches to the very depths of conjugal society. And very probably in this life of cohabitation, as nowhere else, does conjugal love demonstrate its relationship to the primary purpose of marriage. It was love that drew the spouses into marriage; very likely it will be their love that will cause them to remain in this state. By preserving this community of life love will bring about the accomplishment of the primary purpose of marriage, the procreation of children. For it will induce the spouses to the performance of those conjugal actions which are themselves acts of love. Even then love will not leave the scene. As it will be necessary for the spouses to educate their children, their love will be present to inspire them. It will bind them together into the most intimate union of spirit, whereby this task will be accomplished in the most effective manner possible.

In turn, this preservation of the common life can be an important aid in the efforts of the spouses to attain "mutual sanctification." We know that cohabitation, enjoins upon the spouses the duty of avoiding long separations from each other. For if one spouse were permitted to absent himself without reason or without the consent of his partner, grave harm might result for this partner. For example, relative to the *debitum,* we must consider the grave danger of incontinence that might be present and also the danger to conjugal love because of the enforced privation of this party from an act which by its nature fosters love. Vermeersch agrees that such an absence may quite possibly amount to a mortal sin. It will amount to such, as often as it is equivalent

[13] Vermeersch, A., S.J., *Theologiae Moralis,* IV, p. 72: "Communio cubiculi, non solius, tecti, coniugibus summopere commendanda est. Cubiculorum enim separatio, praeterquam quod peccatis et suspicionibus facilem occasionem praebet, non leviter mutuo amori damnosa demonstratur, et, teste experientia, frequens causa est coniugorum infelicium et divortiorum."

to a grievously sinful denial of the *debitum*.[14] At times the absence of one party will be warranted, provided a sufficient cause exists for that absence. Vermeersch again states that: "Just causes could be: honest recreation, restoration of health, the necessity of avoiding loss or for support of the family, or for administering one's affairs, (finally) the exigency of the common good."[15] In view of its aim to attain the "mutual sanctification" of the spouses, we might state, in this connection, that it will be the role of conjugal love to induce the spouses to avoid absenting themselves, if such an absence would place one's partner in an occasion of sin. And their love should be strong enough, so that even were a just cause to arise requiring their absence, they would be able to forego the trip in the interest of the greater need of their partner. This is the way Christian conjugal love should work. It will cause them to disregard their own self-interests and pleasures, and will induce them to place in the forefront the spiritual well-being of their partners. It will impel them at times to forego certain business and pleasure trips in the interest of remaining at home and attending to the needs of their spouses. It will move a husband to foresake employment that would mean long separation from home, provided that is feasible and possible. In fine, if such a spirit pervades their lives, a bountiful measure of temporal happiness is certain to accrue to them, and likewise will redound upon their eternal happiness in heaven.

Our next consideration will be of several evils that are absolutely opposed to those conjugal goods, the *tria bona,* which we proposed as proper objects of conjugal love. These evils are divorce, infidelity, contraception and abortion. These evils aim not only at the destruction of conjugal love, but also place a grave obstacle in the way of the "mutual sanctification" of the spouses.

[14] *Ibid.:* "Altero coniuge *invito,* sine causa sufficiente abesse, erit *mortale:* a) Quotiens mortalem debiti negationem includit; b) si non ad breve tempus fuerit: quod cum in se tum ex alterius damno aut tristitia pensandum erit."

[15] *Ibid.:* "Causae *iustae* esse possunt: honesta recreatio, curanda valetudo, necessitas vel propria vitandi damni aut familiae alendae, vel administrandae rei familiaris, exigentia boni publici."

ARTICLE II, DIVORCE

Ordinarily, when we speak of divorce, we mean the rupture of conjugal relations and the separation of the spouses from conjugal life. Also included in this notion, especially as understood at the present time among non-Catholics, is the privilege of remarriage for the two erstwhile spouses. In order to judge the evil attached to such an action, it is necessary to consider first, by whose authority the divorce was decreed. For example, Cappello declares: "Arbitrary dissolubility, that which takes place at the instance of the spouses themselves, is repugnant to a *primary* law of nature, inasmuch as it is opposed to the principal end of matrimony, i.e., the procreation and due education of children."[16] Under these circumstances a divorce would be considered as intrinsically evil, and hence is altogether forbidden. On the other hand "*Non-arbitrary* dissolubility, i.e., restricted within certain limits, is repugnant to a *secondary* law of nature, because, having been permitted, it renders most difficult the attainment of the primary end."[17] Divorce, under these circumstances, is evil but not intrinsically so, and hence under certain conditions and at certain times can be permitted, e.g., by dispensation of God. In this thesis, since we are dealing principally with a secondary end of marriage, we intend merely to acknowledge that the primary argument against divorce is based on the primary end of marriage—the great difficulty involved in the proper rearing of children when the parents have been separated[18]—and then concentrate on the secondary argument—the harm inflicted on the secondary ends of marriage by divorce. We will show how divorce goes directly contrary to "mutual helpfulness" which should be expressed by the spouses, how it is destructive of conjugal love,

[16] Cappello, Felix M-, S.J., *Tractatus Canonico-Moratis De Sacramentis,* V, p. *737* : "Dissolubilitas *arbitraria,* relicta mero coniugum arbitrio, repugnat iuri naturae *primario,* quatenus opponitur fini principali coniugii, i.e., procreationi et debitae educationi prolis."

[17] *Ibid.* : "Dissolubilitas etiam *non arbitraria,* scit, intra certos limites restricta, iuri naturae secundario adversatur, quia, ea admissa, consecutio finis matrimonii fieret valde difficilis."

[18] Joyce, *op. dt.,* p. 21.

and finally, how it prevents attainment of love's object—the "mutual sanctification" of the spouses.

Before proceeding further, it would be well to divert our attention for a moment to the most important fact that divorce stands opposed to the unalterable law of God. Nowhere is this teaching more strikingly stated than in the Encyclical letter, *"Casti Connubii,"* of Pope Pius XI. He states:

> Opposed to all these reckless opinions (divorce, etc.), Venerable Brethren, stands the unalterable law of God, fully confirmed by Christ, a law that can never be deprived of its force by the decree of man, the ideas of a people or the will of any legislator: "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." (Mt. 19:6) And if any man, acting contrary to this law, shall have put asunder, his action is null and void, and the consequence remains, as Christ Himself has explicitly confirmed: Everyone that putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery." (Luke 16:18)[ie]

Standing as it does in its opposition to the law of God, it becomes opposed also to the *"bonum sacramenti,"* that good of marriage which regards the duty of the spouses to live together and forbids the one who departs from the common life, whether it be wife or husband, from forming a new union, even for the sake of children?[0] It is to be noted in Christian marriage this good takes upon itself a new stability and a new firmness, since it is supported by the sacramental graces. "These two persons are now

[e]Pope Pius XI, *op, cit.,* 573 f.: "Verum, contra lias quoque insanias omnes stat, Venerabiles Fratres, una lex Dei certissima, a Christo amplissime confirmata, nullis hominum decretis vel scitis populorum, nulla legumlatorum voluntate debilitanda: "Quod Deus coniunxit, homo non separet." Quod quidem si iniuria homo separaverit, irritum id prorsus fuerit iure propterea, ut plus semel vidimus, Christus ipse asseveraverit: "Omnis qui dimittit uxorem suam et alteram ducit, moechatur; et qui dimissam a viro ducit, moechatur." (PPt, pp. 27-28.)

[0]St. Augustine, *De Genesi Ad Litteram,* Lib. IX, cap. 7 (CSEL 28-1, 275 f.). "(Bona nuptiae) Hoc autem tripertitum est; fides, proles, sacramentum . . . in sacramento, (attenditur) ut coniugium non separetur et dimissus aut dimissa nec causa prolis alteri coniungatur."

one, as Christ and His Church are one; their union is as indissoluble as that mystic union of Christ and the Church."[21] Even here love has already entered into the picture, for this *bonum* is one of the three specific benefits which the spouses have willed to each other through conjugal love. Once it is taken away, the way is prepared for the removal of the other two. Love is thus destroyed.

That divorce wreaks great harm upon the secondary ends of marriage is all too evident A brief examination shows that once divorce has become a reality, mutual help and mutual love between this man and this woman cease. First, we consider the more general term, "mutual help." All theologians, as well as all right-minded people, agree that mutual help is stopped by divorce, e.g., *Payen*[22]* *and* Merkelbach.[28] The reason underlying this is rather obvious. The spouses need each other, not only in those matters which pertain to the procreation and education of children, but also in those affairs which refer to themselves. Because of the peculiar characteristics of each sex, the spouses are said to mutually complement each other. Each one has something which he can give the other; each one lacks something which he can find in the other. This is the manner in which nature has endowed the sexes. Only too evidently will separation bring this cooperation to an end. Mutual help will stop, and their mutual needs will go unfulfilled.

A similar condition prevails in the case of mutual love. Divorce hastens the process of destruction,[24] even if, by chance, some trace of it be left after conjugal life has disintegrated. Perhaps, if we consider the question from a different point of view, the resultant picture will have more meaning for us. We will consider it from the point of view of the effect that dissolubility or indissolubility has upon the love of the spouses. Dissolubility prevents the complete union of souls for which conjugal love strives. Thus we have Vermeersch speaking of the obstacle that the mere

[21] Farrell, Walter, O.P., *A Companion to the Summa,* IV, p. 411.
[22] Payen, *op. cit.,* I, p. 77.
[28] Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 806.
[24] *Ibid.*

possibility of divorce puts in the way of perfect union between the spouses.[25]* Joyce's statement is more significant in that it gives us a full description of the situation with which we are dealing. He states:

> When ultimate separation is possible, the two partners cannot give themselves unreservedly to each other. Each must bear in mind that the present state of things is provisional. Common sense dictates that rash commitments should be avoided, so that, should a severance come, it should not involve the total shipwreck of life. The full identification of interests is not to be thought of. *Nor can anything be more destructive of conjugal love than this possibility.* Love calls for confidence. Where divorce may occur, confidence can hardly exist.[20]

Two more important facts are brought out by Payen. He says that the spouses are not so inclined to have patience in bearing with one another's faults when they know that they have the freedom to remarry (patience has much to do with the preservation of love). Then again the fear of dismissal weighs heavily upon the woman who suffers the greater losses through divorce.[27] It becomes rather obvious from the statements of these authors that dissolubility can have nothing but a harmful effect on the love of the spouses. Where there is fear, there can be no love, "for love that introduces an element of time and looks to an end has ceased to be love by ceasing to be complete surrender."[28]

On the other hand the facts are no less conclusive as to the beneficial effects of indissolubility on the love of the spouses. Only indissolubility can clear the way and make possible that union of souls in which conjugal love truly consists. Pope Pius XI indicates this when he says: "both husband and wife possess a positive guarantee of the endurance of this stability which that generous yielding of their persons and the intimate fellowship

" Vermeersch, A., S.J., *What Is Marriage!* p. 11.
** Joyce, *op. cit.,* p. *23.* (Italics mine.)
Λ Payen, *op. cit.,* I, p. 77.
""Farrell, *op. cit.,* IV, p. 411.

of their hearts by their nature strongly require. . "[29] And Joyce points out that: "if it is open to either party to depart at will, it follows that the partnership can never be more than half-hearted. . . . The full identification of all interests, apart from which this union fails of its purpose, can never be realized."[80] Finally there is the remark of Vermeersch on the great blessing of indissolubility for the institution of marriage: "By removing the fear of a breach, it makes way for that full intimacy which is the joy of the home. . ."[81] We conclude our remarks on this point by referring once more to Joyce. In a most excellent passage wherein he expresses the nature of conjugal love as a "union of the affections as well as of body," and where "passion is at once reinforced and elevated by the conscious choice of intelligence and free-will," we find this noteworthy statement: "This love can only find full satisfaction in that fusion of lives of which we have spoken above. And such fusion is, of its very nature, only possible when the union is permanent."[82]

Indissolubility also has other effects on the love of the spouses. St. Thomas says that the love of the spouses will be more faithful as long as they know that they are indivisibly joined together.[88] It prevents disagreements from growing into bitterness, thus removing grave perils to conjugal love.[84] Indeed as Merkelbach says: "The law of indissolubility imposes on the spouses the obligation of solicitously preserving both the harmony of souls and Christian charity, and also of avoiding any disagreements, especially those which prepare the way for separation."[88]

" Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 553 f.: "Et primum quidem coniuges in hac firmitate certum habent perennitatis signaculum, quod generosa propriae personae traditio et intima suorum animorum consociatio suapte natura tantopere exigit, cum vera caritas finem nesciat." (PPt, p. 12.)

[40] Joyce, *op. cit.,* p. 17.

"Vermeersch, *"What Is Marriage?"* p. 27.

" Joyce, *op. cit., p.* 18.

"St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles,* Liber III, Cap. 123: "Sic enim fidelior amor unius ad alterum erit, dum cognoscunt se indivisibiliter conjunctos. .

"Vermeersch, "IF/iat *Is Marriage?"* p. 27.

" Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* III, p. 823: "Lex indissolubilitatis coniugibus imponit obligationem sollicite servandi animorum concordiam et Christianam charitatem, atque cavendi quidquid discordiis ac ipsi praesertim separationi viam sternere possit."

Finally, the nature of conjugal love itself is an effective argument against divorce. Already we have found, in discussing the qualities of this love, that it is of its nature to tend towards permanency.[36] As Mersch says: "(A man) ought to give himself for an entire life. If he wished the conjugal union, but pretended not to renounce by the same act the right of taking himself back, he would give himself while refusing himself, and would therefore go contrary to the essential requirements of love."[87] Thus spouses with a true concept of this love firmly implanted within them are supplied with an effective weapon for the combating of divorce. It must be remembered that this statement retains its force only on the supposition that the conditions for a conjugal love of a true nature are fulfilled. This implies that this love is not all passion, nor a union of souls only. It is a combination of both, with an emphasis on the spiritual side, as is befitting man's rational nature. Viewed in this light, this balanced love provides a strong and effective guarantee for the stability of marriage.

Consequent on the destruction of conjugal love in Christian marriage is the destruction of its object, the "mutual sanctification" of the spouses. As divorce leaves the spouses to pursue their separate ways, it becomes only too evident how openly exposed it leaves the spouses to the dangers of temptation. Specifically, there is the danger of infidelity. And of course if there is remarriage on the part of either, there is the spectre of adultery hanging over the one who attempts this. Thus does divorce complete its cycle of evil:

One question now remains to be answered; it is posed by the Pauline Privilege, Some wonder whether this could not be compared to divorce, wreaking the same harm that it does. Morrison answers no, and so explains:

> If then God—and God alone—can and does promise with His grace to obviate these secondary hurts to the due begetting and education of children and the proper

[36] *Supra,* p, 57 f.

[87] Mersch, Emile, S.J., *Morality and the Mystical Body,* p. 217.

> unity and harmony of the wife and husband, the intrinsic evil is done away with and the action of divorce and remarriage by divine authority, with the divine guarantees of a special aid and Providence, become good. . . . But, as God is Master and as His Providence is sovereign, the unfitting consequences which in the nature of the case do flow from humanly administered divorce as a general rule, can by His Mercy be obviated. Thus, with the reason for forbidding divorce and remarriage securely guaranteed against working hurt, the reason for forbidding disappears. God consequently is not violating a law He made when He permits the Pauline Privilege for spiritual interests and as a means of furthering the true faith and its propagation.[88]

ARTICLE III. INFIDELITY

Of all the evils that set out to destroy marriage and married life, the one that is most insidious is infidelity.[38] It does not aim to destroy marriage by the slow process from without, but from within bores immediately and directly to the very foundations upon which marriage is based. It wounds marriage in its most cardinal provision, for it attacks the right to which the spouses have pledged themselves. It is the right which forms the basis of the matrimonial contract, the right, perpetual and exclusive, to the performance of those actions *per se* capable of bringing about the procreation of children.[40] It is the right from which all the other rights and duties of marriage flow. For this reason it is easy to understand why a spouse who violates this right of the other does a grave injury to his partner. And once fidelity is breached in this matter, it is not difficult to see how infidelity will extend itself to the other rights of marriage. For one who cannot be faithful in a promise of such great importance cannot

[88] Morrison, Bakewell, SJ., *Cod is [is Founder,* pp. 268-69.

[38] "The term "infidelity" as used in this thesis is not to be understood in its ordinary theological sense, but in the popular sense of that term where it is synonymous with the term "unfaithfulness," i.e., guilty of the sin of adultery.

[40] Codex Iuris Canonicis, No. 1081, 2: "Consensus matrimonialis est actus voluntatis quo utraque pars tradit et acceptat ius in corpus, perpetuum et exclusivum, in ordine ad actus per se aptos ad prolis generationem."

be expected to be faithful in matters of less importance. It is thus safe to say that infidelity inflicts grave injury on the institution of marriage. In view of this what must be the injury to conjugal love? It, too, must suffer heavily since it is based upon the mutual trust and fidelity of the spouses. As Zeiger has said, the foundation of all true love must be placed in mutual trust?[1] Once this foundation crumples, love must fall. Infidelity, if it does not destroy love, gravely injures it.[41]*

On the other hand an altogether different picture is presented when the vow of fidelity is conscientiously preserved by the spouses. In place of being gravely injured or destroyed, conjugal love is nourished and strengthened. Let us for a moment consider the effect of this good in relation to conjugal love. Pope Pius XI states the relationship thus:

> This conjugal faith, however, which is most aptly called by St. Augustine the "faith of chastity," blooms more freely, more beautifully and more nobly, when it is rooted in that more excellent soil, the love of husband and wife which pervades all the duties of married life and holds pride of place in Christian marriage. For matrimonial faith demands that husband and wife be joined in an especially holy and pure love, not as adulterers love each other, but as Christ loved the Church.[48]

Commenting upon this passage of the Holy Father, Vermeersch explains: "The great positive duty (of conjugal fidelity) is that

[41] Ivo Zeiger, S.J., "Nova Definitio Matrimonii," p. 45*.

[*] Merkelbach, *op. cit.,* HI, p. 782: "In laudata encyctica Pius XI totus est in tribus bonis declarandis, et in denuntiandis erroribus et vitiis oppositis: . . . b) Bono fidei, adulterina laesio castitatis coniugaiis, emancipatio feminae seu laesio subordination!s eius ad virum, et laesio amoris coniugaiis."

[48] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* p. 548: "Haec autem, quae a St. Augustino aptissime appellatur 'castitatis fides,' et facilior et multo etiam iucundior ac nobilior efflorescet ex altero capite praestantissimo; ex coniugali scilicet amore, qui omnia coniugaiis vitae officia pervadit et quemdam tenet in Christiano coniugio principatum nobilitatis. Postulat praeterea matrimonii fides ut vir et uxor singulari quodam sanctoque ac puro amore coniuncti sunt; neque ut adulteri inter se ament, sed ut Christus dilexit Ecclesiam. . (PPt, pp. 7-8.)

of mutual love inspired by charity. The marriage bond sets up between the spouses an intimacy which no other surpasses or even equals; the marriage would never have been entered upon without the mutual affection which was necessary for the parties to give themselves to each other."[44] By confining, and thus promoting the intimacy between the two spouses, conjugal fidelity prepares for a closer and deeper union of souls. It strengthens the ties of love between the spouses, and in so doing it indubitably effects its own good. For as the injuring of one brings about the injuring of the other, so the strengthening of the one will bring about the strengthening of the other. There is thus the greatest connection and inter-relation between conjugal fidelity and conjugal love.

In a somewhat more detailed form the following may be called a summary of the qualities which conjugal fidelity implies in conjugal love. First, there is implied a love that is pure and holy.[45] Vermeersch adds to this the notion that this love is to be a "love of charity."[48] Finally, we have Wayne who describes it as a love that is "ardent and humble, intimate and reverent, which each reserves for the other, serving to draw them ever closer to one another, strengthening a tie that must take the strain of adversity, worry, sickness, unhappy moods."[4']

Secondly and indirectly, the effect of fidelity on conjugal love will be seen by a comparison of this good with the notion of "mutual help." Wernz-Vidal introduce us to this aspect of the question by stating that this good implies that "the spouses should honour one another with a holy love and bestow upon each other that aid and comfort in which is found the secondary end of marriage."[48] This is to state nothing else but that conjugal fidelity demands mutual helpfulness. This is in effect what Vermeersch

[**] Vermeersch, A., S.J., *"IVhat Is Marriage?"* p. 22.

[45] Cf. *supra,* note 43; also, Payen, *op. cit.,* p. 82.

[] "Vermeersch, *"IVkai Is Marriage?"* p. 22.

[47] Wayne, T. G., *Morals and Marriage* (London: Longmans, 1936), p. 35.

[48] Wernz-Vidal, *Jus Canonicum,* V, p. 35. "Illud importat, ut coniuges sese sancto amore prosequantur sibique mutuum praestent *adiulorium* et *solamen,* in quo reperitur secundus finis matrimonii."

states when he says: "(the) laws of God sanction an order of mutual relations which is for the good of the parties. The partner who violates that order does an injury to the other party, which is manifestly contrary to conjugal fidelity, since that demands mutual helpfulness."[79] This principle which we have enunciated can have a very practical effect in the lives of the spouses as far as their love is concerned. St. Augustine gives us a clue to this when he tells us "married people owe one another not only the faith of their sexual intercourse, for the begetting of children . . . but also, in a way, a mutual service of sustaining one another's weakness in order to shun unlawful intercourse."[80] The refusal on the part of one or the other to render the *debitum* can well mean not only an injury to fidelity, but also can lead to a lessening of love. Previously we have stated that intercourse was normally necessary at times in order to foster and nourish the mutual love of the spouses. A refusal in such a case would have but one meaning; obviously a lessening of love would result. St. John Chrysostom rather fittingly describes the effects of such a refusal. His words best sum up what we have wished to state. They follow thus: "The wife should not observe continence if the husband is unwilling, nor should the husband do so without his wife's consent. Why so? Because great evils have often sprung from this source; for adulteries and fornications and the ruin of families have often arisen hence.[81] Following this he treats an actual case:

> So take the case of a husband and wife where the wife is continent without the husband's consent. If in such circumstances he commits fornication, or though abstaining from fornication, frets and grows restless and gives all kinds of trouble to his wife, where is all the gain of

[**] Vermeersch, *"What Is Marriage?"* p. 21.

[79] St. Augustine, *De Bono Coniugali,* VI, 6 (CSEL 41-195). "Debent ergo sibi coniugati non solum ipsius sexus sui commiscendi fidem liberorum procreandorum causa, quae prima est humani generis in ista mortalitate societas, verum etiam infirmitatis invicem excipiendae ad illicitos concubitus evitandos mutuam quodam modo servitutem, ut etsi alteri eorum perpetua continentia placeat, nisi ex alterius consensu non possit."

[81] St. John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam I ad Corinthios* 7:5, Homilia XIX (P.G. 65, 152).

> fasting and continence if there is a rift made in their love. There is none.[82]

Finally, the mutual fidelity of the spouses will have its effect on love's object. Joyce confirms this when he says: "Within the Church, the mutual fidelity of man and wife is not motived by self-interest, but has in view the spiritual good and the eternal reward of the other partner also."[88] Probably in no other relationship of marriage do the spouses show more concern for the spiritual welfare of their partners than they do when preserving fidelity. An example of this may be had in the positive aspect of this good. In commanding the rendering of the *debitum, we* can see what an effective remedy is provided for sins against purity. In thus allowing the spouses to keep intact their friendship with God, fidelity can be said to effectually promote their "mutual sanctification."

In conclusion we note one important corollary which is given to us by Leclercq, and which seems to have special importance for this modern age. He says:

> (There are) those who believe that they are remaining faithful to their marriage vows as long as they do not have carnal intercourse with anyone but their own spouse, but they deem it permissible to enter into sentimental relations outside of the home. *They fail to see that by so doing they destroy in their home that union of souls which is more important than the union of bodies.*[64]

ARTICLE IV. CONTRACEPTION

There are some Catholics among countless others who transgress the laws of God and of the Church as regards contraception. There are those to whom "selfish pleasure" means so much, that they refuse to accept the pronouncements of God and of the Church on this matter. There are still others who, basing their thoughts more on sentiment than on reason, think that such a

[82] *Ibid.*
[88] Joyce, *op. cit.,* p. 149.
[64] Leclercq, Jacques, *Marriage and the Family,* p. 126 (Italics mine).

practice is permitted because ill-health, poor economic conditions or other causes make the bearing of children inadvisable. To these and all others who insist on maintaining such a viewpoint, the Church firmly answers that such an act, inasmuch as it completely sets aside the order of nature, is intrinsically evil, and hence cannot be permitted under any circumstances, no matter how much hardship it might seem to cause. The words of Pope Pius XI eloquently proclaim this teaching:

> But no reason, however grave may be put forward by which anything intrinsically against nature may become conformable to nature and morally good. Since, therefore, the conjugal act is destined primarily by nature for the begetting of children, those who in exercising it deliberately frustrate its natural power and purpose sin against nature and commit a deed which is shameful and intrinsically vicious.[66]

Besides the intrinsic evil of contraception, there is to be considered the harm that it causes to the secondary ends of marriage. Fundamental here is the consideration that such a practice leads to a lack of mutual respect on the part of the spouses, which, in turn, results in serious injury to the "mutual help" and "mutual love" of the spouses. Thus Payen declares: "In that it takes away mutual reverence, it extinguishes mutual conjugal love and thence mutual help."[56] Vermeersch in speaking of the necessity of preserving the natural order in conjugal relations says that the secondary ends of marriage would be frustrated by wrong relations. He declares: "Such relations cannot foster true love, which supposes mutual respect; too often they result only in disagreement

[66] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* p. 559: "At nulla profecto ratio, ne gravissima quidem, efficere potest, ut quod intrinsice est contra naturam, id cum natura congruens et honestum fiat. Cum autem actus coniugii suapte natura proli generandae sit destinatus, qui, in eo exercendo, naturali hac eum vi atque virtute de industria destituunt, contra naturam agunt et turpe quid atque intrinsice inhonestum operantur." (PPt, p. 17.)

[56] Payen, *op. cil,,* II, p. 424. "Eo enim ipso quod mutuam tollit reverentiam, *mutuum amorem* conjugalem, eo nomine dignum, ac proinde mutuum adjutorium, exstinguit"; cf. also, Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia Moralis,* II, p. 640.

and separation."[67] Our attention is called to the "true love" of which Vermeersch speaks. No act can be an expression of "true love" unless that act is performed in conformity with the laws of nature. Mersch expresses this fact very clearly when he states: "This activity (the marital act) is then intrinsically bound to love, and one cannot arouse it voluntarily except in conformity with the natural law, which is the law of love. . ."[68] If one would persist in calling an onanistic act an act of love, the most that can be said of it is that it is a sensual love. For any man who would induce his wife to the performance of such an action would not be treating her as an object of love, but as an object of sensual delight. As Payen brings out: "Onanism is opposed to the dignity of the woman; it reduces her to a state of servitude, where she becomes a mere instrument of pleasure, and more like a harlot than a true wife."[69]

Pursuing this matter further, we have Bonnar declaring contrary to the opinion of the Birth Preventionists, that such an act fails even to satisfy the requirements for a full *physical* expression of love. Only the natural act designed by God completely and satisfactorily fulfills this purpose. And so he says: "even physically, the Birth Preventionist refuses *fully* to give himself to his partner."[60] And what is more important to us, the full *psychological* expression is incomplete. Bonnar again declares: "In the first place there is not the complete surrender which full love demands. Again, love, by its nature, is not barren but productive, and, therefore, to deliberately render it barren by positive interference, is to render it psychologically incomplete."[61] In more vivid terminology Vann states this same idea: "Contraception tears love-making from its human completeness, and destroys a great part—the perfection—of its creativeness."[62] Our

[67] Vermeersch, *"IVhat Is Marriage?"* p. 45.

[68] Mersch, *op. cit.,* p. 213.

[69] Payen, *op. cit.,* II, p, 424. "Adde quod opponitur onanismus dignitati mulieri quae *in servitutem cadit,* cum fiat weruju *voluptatis instrumentum,* et meretrici similior quam verae uxori."

[60] Bonnar, A., O.F.M., *The Catholic Doctor,* pp. 59-60.

[61] *Ibid.,* p. 60.

[62] Vann, Gerald, O.P., *The Heart of Man,* p. 107.

picture is completed by the words of Father Connell: "Undoubtedly, too, the psychological benefits of marital intercourse, such as the deepening of conjugal love and the contentment consequent on complete sexual satisfaction, suffer greatly from contraceptive practices. There is inevitably a lowering of mutual respect between the husband and wife who agree to make use of contraception."[03] Thus it can be said that the act of the contraception!st has failed even in its attempts to express a *complete love.* Because this failure is one with a certain deliberateness attached to it, it is to be even more reproved; and it cannot be expected to promote the mutual love of the spouses.

Finally, that contraception brings to an end the "mutual sanctification" of the spouses is only too evident from what has already been said. This fact is borne out by Wayne who remarks: "Impurity committed by married people is made worse by the fact that it lowers the sacramental dignity of their state. If the impure action be mutual, then man and woman, instead of causing grace to one another, are the occasions of sin to the person they should most care for and protect from harm."[04] As all theologians agree to the truth of the above statement, we feel that no further testimonies need be adduced here. It cannot be doubted that, when the spouses see fit to revert to this practice habitually, the manifest deliberateness of the act shows clearly that the spouses are bent only on seeking the false happiness of sensual pleasure. Until they return once again to the quest of true moral values and to the realization that only in them may true happiness be found, the aim of "mutual sanctification" remains as a mere goad to blunted consciences.

Relative to the treatment of the practice of contraception, it is only proper to consider at the same time the practice of Periodic Continence, popularly known as the "Rhythm" theory, and speak of it in its relation to conjugal love. First of all it is necessary to state that this practice is not always illicit or unlawful; it can

[03] Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., "Birth Control: The Case for the Catholic," p. 472.

[04] Wayne, *op. cit.,* p. 53.

be justified in certain cases if there is an objectively sufficient reason for resorting to it.[85] Provided then that such a condition is fulfilled, that the husband and wife agree to its use, and provided also that there is no danger of incontinence, the practice may be permitted the spouses. However, be that as it may, there still remains to be considered the danger and possible threat to the existence of conjugal love that may result from its practice. This danger and threat remain, and hence is to be guarded against, because in the normal course of events the love of husband and wife is dependent to some degree on normal sex relations.[68] This practice confines marital sex activity to those periods of time in the menstrual cycle of the woman when the conception of a child is not likely to take place. This restriction in itself constitutes a danger to those who are unable to exercise self-control over a long period of time; this is the danger of incontinence. But over and beyond this there is another danger, because for the woman the time when conception is more likely to occur is coincident with the time of highest sexual desire. The danger is this, as Morrison has declared:

> The result can well be that the wife, eager for affection in an attractive and compelling way, may *tease* quite unconsciously, may, all unawares, make larger invitations to her husband's love than at other times during the month. If this is foreseen and calculated for, the strain it could induce will be minimized. If it is not understood, it may unfortunately produce a sense of tension and a "snappiness" that make the couple wonder what is happening to them.[87][75]

[65] Griese, N. Orville, *The "Rhythm" in Marriage and Christian Morality,* 75 f. (Note the confirmation of this view in the recent statement of the Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, as he spoke to the Italian Catholic Union of Midwives, Oct. 29, 1951. He declares: "There are serious motives, such as those often mentioned in the so-called medical, eugenic, economic and social 'indications,' that can exempt for a long time, perhaps even the whole duration of the marriage, from the positive and obligatory carrying out of the act. (Moral Questions Affecting Married Life (Washington: N.C.W.C., 1951), P- 14.))

[**] *Ibid.,* pp. 62-63; *supra, 76* f.

[·*] Morrison, *op. cit.,* p. 221.

As to the seriousness of the danger present, Kelly remarks that: "the attempt to limit intercourse to the "safe period" constitutes a serious danger to, if not a direct attack on the secondary ends of marriage."[e8] The danger to the secondary ends, particularly to conjugal love, cannot be underestimated. The strain that such a practice «inflicts on the spouses is an ever-present threat, one that could be seriously injurious to their love. In conclusion we bring to'mind a warning issued by Father Kelly. He warns that: "Only exceptional couples can take up the practice of the "rhythm-theory" without exposing their married lives to grave dangers; and even these couples usually need the grace of God."[ea]

ARTICLE V. ABORTION

Finally, we come to the consideration of that evil which destroys conjugal love in its natural term. This is the evil of abortion by which is brought about the destruction of the non-viable foetus. Those who make use of such a practice resort to many excuses to conceal the guilt of their sinful actions. For example, they speak of the necessity of protecting the health of the mother, the necessity of relieving her of the intolerable burden of rearing the child, etc. But, though these are found and adduced, yet, no matter how cogent, they must be rejected. For it remains that abortion is, and will be regarded always, as intrinsically evil. Hence, no reason, however grave, will excuse those who procure it or assist in procuring it, from the guilt of grave sin. Pope Pius XI most emphatically declared this to be the teaching of the Church when he stated:

> However much we may pity the mother whose health and even life is gravely imperiled in the performance of the duty allotted to her by nature, nevertheless what could ever be a sufficient reason for excusing in any way the direct murder of the innocent? This is precisely what we are dealing with here. Whether inflicted upon the mother or upon the child, it is against the precept of God and the law of nature: "Thou shalt not kill" (Ex. 20:13):

[e8] Gerald Kelly, S.J., "Current Theology," ThS, 8 (1947), p. 10$.
[ea] *Ibid.*

> The life of each is equally sacred, and no one has the power, not even the public authority, to destroy it.[70]

And as if the Church were not sufficiently stressing the gravity of the crime by means of these words, she further impresses upon her children the seriousness of such an action by branding with the bann of excommunication all those who dare to cooperate in it."

Besides being gravely evil in itself, abortion has other serious consequences. One is its effect on conjugal love. To state this in the best practical manner is to state that abortion destroys conjugal love in that which is its natural term, the child. For the child, as we have explained previously, is the fruit of love.[72] In a manner somewhat similar to that in which we say that marriage retains its ordination to its ends, regardless of their realization, so may we speak of conjugal love.[73] It, too, is ordained or is related to the primary end of marriage. It is its purpose to bring about an easier attainment of this end. Thus, it will retain its relation to the primary end, even though this end may never be realized. But supposing a case in which nature cooperates perfectly, this is what will happen. Love inclines the spouses to union, to a union of affections primarily, but ultimately to a physical union. With nature cooperating perfectly, the result of that union will be the conception of a child. Then the husband and wife deliberately procure the destruction of that child. With that destruction love in its natural term is destroyed. We can thus state that abortion destroys conjugal love in its natural term, the child. Moreover, it may lead to the destruction of conjugal love, itself. The follow-

[70] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.,* 562 f.: "Quantopere Nos misereat matris, cuî ex naturae officio gravia imminent sanitatis, immo ipsius vitae pericula: at quae possit umquam causa valere ad ullo modo excusandam directam innocentis necem? De hac enim hoc loco agitur. Sive ea matre infertur sive proli, contra Dei praeceptum est vocemque naturae: 'Non occides!' Res enim aeque sacra utriusque vita, cuius opprimendae nulla esse unquam poterit ne publicae quidem auctoritati facultas." (PPt, p. 19.)

[71] Codex Iuris Canonici, No. 2350.

[72] *Supra, p. 81.*

[73] *Supra,* p. 65.

ing words which Gerald Vann has spoken in regard to contraception are very appropriate here. He states: "Love is always outward-turning, always an impulsion to making; and if you willfully frustrate it and turn it upon itself, it becomes destructive and may well in the end become self-destructive."[77] In destroying that which should be the fruit of their love, it may well be that their selfishness which has accomplished this will bring about the destruction of their love for one another.

The injury that abortion brings to the "mutual sanctification" of the spouses is seen most demonstrably in the case where the husband either assists or urges the wife to procure the abortion. His real position is that of guardian of the family and the protector of its morals. It is his duty, if needs be, to chasten his wife, thus effectively promoting her sanctification.[78] But instead, wishing to avoid his own role in the rearing of the child, he selfishly allows the wife to pursue her course of action without interference, or worse, even assists her in doing so. The effect of his .action is to seriously impede their attainment of "mutual sanctification," an end which he as a Christian spouse should be seriously seeking. In so doing he loses a wonderful opportunity for spiritual progress for himself and his spouse. Christian love is thus thwarted. Now the only concern is whether the spouses can recover from the harmful effects of this action by exerting themselves sufficiently to regain God's friendship, enabling themselves once again to pursue effectively the aim of "mutual sanctification,"

* * * * *

In this chapter we have discussed the relationship of conjugal love to cohabitation, and thence to various evils that afflict the lives of the spouses. These are the practical considerations that had to be discussed in our treatment of conjugal love. In its relation to cohabitation we stressed love as a means of preserving the community of life, and how the relation of conjugal love to

[77] Vann, *op. cit.,* p. 107.

[78] Sirvaitis, Casimiro, C.SC.P., *Casti Connubü Monita de turibus et Officiis,* p. 59.

the primary purpose of marriage was effectively demonstrated in this life. Finally, in this regard, we showed how the preservation of cohabitation or the common life could be an important aid in the efforts of the spouses to attain "mutual sanctification."

In our consideration of the various evils that affect conjugal love, we saw first of all how these were gravely wrong. We then discussed how each worked in accomplishing the destruction or the lessening of mutual help and mutual love. Finally we described in turn the effect of each on love's object, i.e., "mutual sanctification." In conclusion we are led to make the observation that the effects of these evils demonstrate even more clearly and emphatically the necessity of a *true* conjugal love in the lives of the spouses. Its presence will improve considerably their chances of leading a life of joy and happiness. And in their attempts to attain love's object, they will have advanced far in their efforts to reach the ultimate goal of life, i.e., God Himself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

Acta AposMicae Sedis, Commentarium Officiale, Romae, 1909—

Acta Sanctae Sedis, 41 vols., Romae, 1865-1908.

Canones et Decreta Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Tridentini, Ratisbonne: G. 'J. Manz, 1903.

Codex luris Canonici Pii X Pontificis Maximi iussu digestus Benedicti Pafiae XV auctoritate promulgatus, Romae: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanîs, 1936.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum Editum consilio et impensis Academiae litterarum caesareae vindobonensis, 68 vols., Vienna, 1866—

Denzinger, H.-Bannwart, C.-Umberg, J., *Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum,* 21-23 ed., Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder *& Co.,* 1937.

Migne, J. P., *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca,* 161 vols., Parisiis, 1856-1866.

--------, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina,* 221 vols., Parisiis, 1884-1864.

General Works

Aertnys, J.-Damen, C. A., *Theologia Moralis,* 14 ed., Vol. II, Turin : Marietti, 1944.

Allers, Rudolf, *Character Education in Adolescence,* New York: Wagner, 1940.

Alphonsus. St., *Theologia Moralis,* 9 ed., Gaude, Vol. IV, Rome : Vatican, 1905.

Ambrose, St., *Comm, in Ep. ad Ephesios,* PL Migne, 17.

Augustine, St., *De Bono Coniugali,* CSEL, 4L

--------, *De Genesi Ad Litteram,* CSEL, 28-1.

--------, *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia,* CSEL, 42.

--------, *In Generationibus Domini,* Sermo LI, PL, Migne, 38.

--------, *Tractatus LXXXVII in Joannis Evangelium,* PL, Migne, 35.

Basil the Great, St., *Moralia, Regula LXXIII,* PG, Migne, 31.

Bertke, Stanley, *The Possibility of Invincible Ignorance of the Natural Law,* The Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology, n. 58, Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1941.

Bonnar, A., *The Catholic Doctor,* 2 ed., New York: Kenedy, 1939.

Boylan, M. Eugene, *This Tremendous Lover,* Westminster: Newman, 1947.

Brin, P., Farges, A., and Barbedette, D., *Philosophia Scholastica,* 68 ed., Vol. I, Paris: Berche and Pagis, 1937.

Cappello, Felix, *Tractatus Canonico-Moralis de Sacramentis,* 5th ed., Vol. V, Rome: Marietti, 1947.

Chrysostom, St. John, *Γη Epistolam I Ad Corinthios, Homilia XIX, PG,* Migne, 13.

--------, *In Epistolam Ad Ephesios, Homilia XX,* PG, Migne, 62.

Clement of Alexandria, St., *Stromatum, Liber IV,* PG, Migne, 8.

Cohausz, Otto, *The Pope and Christian Marriage.* Trans, by Geo. D. Smith, New York: Benziger, 1933.

Concina, F. Daniele, *Theologia Christiana,* Vol. IV, Neapoli: Paci, 1773.

Cooper, John M., *Birth Control* (pamphlet), Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1923.

--------, *Religion Outlines For Colleges,* 2 ed., Vol. IV, Washington: The Catholic Education Press, 1941.

Cronin, Michael, *The Science of Ethics,* Vol. V, Dublin: Gill, 1939.

D'Arcy, M. C., *The Mind and Heart of Love,* New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1947.

Davis, Henry, *Moral and Pastoral Theology,* 4 ed., Vols. I & IV, London: Sheed & Ward, 1945.

De Guchteneere, R., *Judgment on Birth Control,* New York: Macmillan, 1942.

De Smet, AL, *De Sponsalibus Et Matrimonio,* 4 ed., Belgium : Beyaert, 1927.

Dorns, Herbert, *Du Sens Et De La Fin Du Mariage,* 12 ed., Paris: Desclée, 1937.

--------, *The Meaning of Marriage.* Trans, by Geo. Sayer, New York: Sheed & Ward, 1939.

Farrell, Walter, *A Companion to the Summa,* 4 vols., New York: Sheed & Ward, 1942.

Foerster, F. W., *Marriage and the Sex Problem.* Trans, by Meyrick Booth, New York: Stokes, 1936.

Francis De Sales, St., *Introduction to a Devout Life.* Trans, from the French, Ratisbon : Pustet.

Gasparri, P., *Tractatus Canonicus De Matrimonio, 9* ed., 2 vols., Rome: Vatican, 1932.

Gerrard, Thomas J., *Marriage and Parenthood,* rev. by Edgar Schmiedler, New York: Wagner, 1937.

Gilson, Etienne, *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy.* Trans, by A. H. C. Downes. New York: Scribner's, 1940.

Goldsmith, J. William, *The Competence of the Church and State Over Marnage—Disputed Points.* Canon Law Studies, n. 197, Washington: C.U.A. Press, 1944.

Griese, N. Orville, *The Marriage Contract and the Procreation of Offspring,* Canon Law Studies, n. 226, Washington : C.U.A. Press, 1946.

——----, *The "Rhythm" In Marriage and Christian Morality,* Westminster: Newman, 1944.

Hervé, J. M., *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae,* Vol. III, Paris: Berche et Pagis, 1929.

Hope, Wingfield, *Life Together,* New York: Sheed & Ward, 1943.

Joyce, Geo. H., *Christian Marriage: An Historical and Doctrinal Study,* London: Sheed & Ward, 1933.

Kelly, Gerald, *Modem Youth and Chastity,* St. Louis: The Queen's Work, 1943.

Kirsch, Felix M., *Sex Education and Training In Chastity,* New York: Benzinger, 1930.

Knabenbauer, J., *Commentarius in S. Pauli Apostoli Epistolas,* Paris: Lethielleux, 1912.

Leclercq, Jacques, *Marriage and the Family.* Trans, by Thomas R. Hanley, 2 ed., New York: Pustet, 1942.

Leen, Edward, *The Holy Ghost and His Work in Souls,* New York: Sheed & Ward, 1939.

--------, *Progress Through Mental Prayer,* New York: Sheed & Ward, 1940.

Pope Leo XIII, *"Arcanum,"* ASS, 12 (1880).

McFadden, Charles J., *Medical Ethics for Nurses,* Philadelphia: Davis, 1946.

Marriage-Preparation Course, The Catholic Centre, Ottawa: The University of Ottawa, 1946.

Martindale, C. C., *Wedlock,* London: Sheed & Ward, 1937.

Merkelbach, B., Stimma *Theologiae Moralis, 3* ed., 3 vols., Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1939.

Mersch, E., *Love, Marriage and Chastity.* Trans, with notes by A. B., London: Sheed & Ward, 1944.

--------, *Morality and the Mystical Body.* Trans, by Daniel Ryan, S.J., New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1939.

Moore, Edward R., *The Case Against Birth Control,* New York: Appleton-Century, 1931.

Moore, Thomas Verner, *Personal Mental Hygiene,* New York: Grune & Stratton, 1944.

Morrison, Bakewell, *Character Formation in College,* Milwaukee: Bruce, 1938.

--------, *God Is Its Founder,* Milwaukee: Bruce, 1946.

Naughton, James W., *Pius XII on World Problems,* New York: The America Press, 1943.

Noldin, H.-Schmitt, A., *Summa Theologiae Moralis,* 26 ed., 3 vols., Ratisbon: Rauch, 1940.

Suprema Sacra Congregatio S. Officii, *"Decretum De Finibus Matrimonii,"* AAS, 36 (1944).

Origen, *In Canticum Canticorum, Homilia II,* PG, Migne, 13.

Ostheimer, Anthony L., *The Family: A Thomistic Study in Social Philosophy,* Philosophical Studies, η. 50, Washington: C.U.A. Press, 1939.

Payen, G., *De Matrimonio,* altera editio, Vols. I & II, ZI-KA-WEI: in Typographia T'OU-SE-WE, 1935.

Petrovits, Joseph J., *The New Church Law on Matrimony,* Canon Law Studies, n. 6, Philadelphia: John J. McVey, 1919.

Pope Pius XI, ‘‘Casti Connubii,” AAS, 22 (1930).

--------, *"Vigilanti Cura,"* AAS, 28 (1936).

Pope Pius XII, *“Allocutio mulieribus ab Actione Catholica earumque adiutricibus,"* AAS, 33 (1941).

--------, “To The Italian Catholic Union of Midwives,” An Address delivered on Oct. 29, 1951, contained in *Moral Questions Affecting Married Life* (Washington, N.C.W.C.), 1951.

--------, *“IVOman's Duties in Social and Political Life,"* An Address delivered on Oct. 21, 1945; N.C.W.C. translation.

Prat, Fernand, *The Theology of St. Paul,* 10 ed. Trans, by John L. Stoddard, 2 vols., Westminster: Newman, 1926.

Prümmer, M., *Manuale Theologiae Moralis,* editio altera et tertia, Vol, II, Freiburg: Herder, 1923.

Quigley, Joseph A., *A Summary of the Canon Law on Matrimonial Impediments and Dispensations, 2* ed., Philadelphia; The Dolphin Press, 1942.

The Sacred Roman Rota, Acta Tribunalium-Sacra Romana Rota (Romana Nullitatis Matrimonii et Dispensationis super rato), AAS, 36 (1944),

Scheeben, Matthias J., *The Mysteries of Christianity.* Trans, by Cyril Vollert, St. Louis: Herder, 1946.

Schmiedeler, Edgar, *An Introductory Study of the Family,* New York: Century, 1930.

--------, *Marriage and the Family,* 1 ed., New York: McGraw-Hill, 1946.

Sheen, Fulton J., *Love on Pilgrimage,* Huntington: Our Sunday Visitor, 1946.

Sirvaitis, Casimiro, *Casti Connubii Monita de Juribus et Officiis Patrisfamilias,* Studies in Sacred Theology, n. 80, Washington: C.U.A. Press, 1943.

Ter Haar, Francis, *Mixed Marriages and Their Remedies,* ed. by Francis J. Connell. Trans, by Aloysius Walter, New York: Pustet, 1933.

Thomas Aquinas, St., *Summa Theologica,* Turin: Marietti, 1937.

--------, *Summa Contra Gentiles,* Turin: Marietti, 1937.

--------, *III Sententiarum.*

Vann, Gerald, *The Divine Pity,* New York: Sheed & Ward, 1946.

--------, *The Heart of Man,* New York: Longmans, 1945.

Vermeersch, A., *Theologiae Moralis Principia^Responsa—Consilia,* 3 ed., Vol. IV, Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1944.

--------, *What Is Marriage? A Catechism According to the Encyclical "Casti Connubii" of Pope Pius XL* Trans, by T. L. Bouscaren, S.J., New York: The America Press, 1932.

Von Hildebrand, Dietrich, *In Defense of Purity,* New York: Sheed & Ward, 1935.

--------, *Marriage,* London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1942.

Von Streng, Franz» *Marriage: A Great Sacrament* in *Christ,* ed. and trans, •by Charles P. Bruehl, New York: Benzinger, 1939.

Voste, Jacobo-Maria» *Commentarius in Epistulam Ad Ephesios,* Romae: Collegio Angelico, 1932.

Wayne, T. G.» *Morals and Marriage,* London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1936.

Wernz, F.-Vidal, P., *Jus Canonicum,* 3 ed., by P. Aguirre, Vol. V, *Jus Matrimoniale,* Rome: The Pontifical Gregorian University, 1946.

Periodicals

Adam, Karl, "Sanctification of Marriage," (Part I), *Orate Fratres,* 9 (1935), 171-176.

'--------, "Sanctification of Marriage," (Part II), *Orate Fratres,* 9 (1935), 218-225.

Bertrams, W., "Annotationes: Decretum de Finibus Matrimonii S. Congregatio S. Officii (AAS, 36 (1944) 103)," *Periodica De Re Morali, Canonica, Liturgica,* 33 (1944), 219-228.

Carrel, Alexis, "Married Love," *The Reader's Digest,* 25 (1939), 12-16.

Connell, Francis J., "Birth Control: The Case for the Catholic," *The Atlantic Monthly,* 164 (1939), 468-473.

--------, "The Catholic Doctrine on the Ends of Marriage," *Proceedings of the Foundation Meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America* (New York City, June 25, 26, 1946).

--------, "Ecclesiastical Library Table: Recent Theology," *The Ecclesiastical Review,* 93 (1935), 187-198.

--------, "Ecclesiastical Library Table: Recent Theology," *The Ecclesiastical Review,* '108 (1943), 224-232.

--------, "How Must the Confessor Deal with an Onanist?" *The Ecclesiastical Review,* 107 (1942), 55-64.

--------, "The Intrinsic Evil of Condomistic Relations," *The Ecclesiastical Review,* 108 (1943), 36-39.

--------, "The Problem of Mixed Marriages," *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* 115 (1946), 386-388.

Ford, John C., "Current Theology," *Theological Studies,* 5 (1944), 495-538.

--------, "Marriage: Its Meaning and Purposes," *Theological Studies,* 3 (1942), 333-374.

Gits, A., "The Instruction of the Faithful on Mixed Marriages," *The Clergy Review,* 24 (1944), 355-358.

Hanley, Thomas R., "The Natural Law on Marriage," *The Ecclesiastical Review,* 108 (1943), 195-208.

--------, "The Natural Law on Marriage," *The Ecclesiastical Review,* 108 (1943), 298-309.

Hennrich, Killian J., "Preparing for Matrimony," *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review,* 41 (1941), 1000-1009.

Kelly, Gerald, "Current Theology," *Theological Studies,* 8 (1947), 97-117.

Lavaud, B., "The Interpretation of the Conjugal Act and the Theology of Marriage," *The Thomist,* 1 (1939), 360-378.

Lonergan, Bernard J., "Finality, Love, Marriage," *Theological Studies, 4* (1943), 477-510.

McHugh, J. A., "The Meaning of Marriage," *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review,* 41 (1941), 969-975.

Miller, Ernest F., "Mixed Company Keeping," *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review, 41* (1941), 1073-1079.

Poland, William, "The Natural Law in Marriage," *The Ecclesiastical Review, 22* (1900), 337-354.

Ryan, John A., "How Must the Confessor Deal with an Onanist," *The Ecclesiastical Review,* 107 (1942), 283-286.

--------, "The Moral Teaching of the Encyclical—*Casti Connubii," The Ecclesiastical Review,* 104 (1941), 264-271.

Vermeersch, A., "Encyc. 'Casti Connubii,' Annotationes," *Periodica De Re Morali, Canonica, Liturgica,* 20 (1931), 42-68.

Zeiger, Ivo, "Nova Definitio Matrimonii," *Periodica De Re Morali, Canonica, Liturgica,* 20 (1931), 357-359

Miscellaneous

Statistical Abstract of the U. S.: 1952, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAS—Acta Apostolicae Sedis
ASS—Acta Sanctae Sedis
CSEL—Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
HPR—The Homiletic and Pastoral Review
PG—Migne, Patrologia Graeca
PL—Migne, Patrologia Latina
PPt—Paulist Press translation of the Encyclical, "Casti Connubii."
TAER—The American Ecclesiastical RpVicw
TER—The Ecclesiastical Review
ThS—Theological Studies

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Michael Francis McAuliffe was born in Kansas City, Kansas, on November 22, 1920. He attended the Our Lady of Good Counsel Grade School in Kansas City, Missouri. In 1933 he entered St. John's Catholic Seminary in Kansas City and completed his High School and Junior College courses there in 1939. This same year he was sent to the St. Louis Preparatory Seminary, Webster Groves, Missouri, to pursue his Philosophical Studies. He took his Theological Studies at the Theological College, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. He received the degree of the Licentiate in Sacred Theology in May, 1945, and was ordained to the Sacred Priesthood for service in the Diocese of Kansas City on May 31, 1945,

ALPHABETICAL INDEX